arXiv:1506.02887v2 [math.ST] 26 Jan 2016

Consistency of likelihood estimation for Gibbs point processes

David Dereudre[1] and Frédéric Lavancier[2,3]

[1]Laboratoire de Mathématiques Paul Painlevé, University of Lille 1, France
[2]Laboratoire de Mathématiques Jean Leray, University of Nantes, France
[3]Inria, Centre Rennes Bretagne Atlantique, France.

Wednesday 27th January, 2016

Abstract

Strong consistency of the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) for parametric Gibbs point process models is established. The setting is very general. It includes pairwise pair potentials, finite and infinite multibody interactions and geometrical interactions, where the range can be finite or infinite. The Gibbs interaction may depend linearly or non-linearly on the parameters, a particular case being hardcore parameters and interaction range parameters. As important examples, we deduce the consistency of the MLE for all parameters of the Strauss model, the hardcore Strauss model, the Lennard-Jones model and the area-interaction model.

Keywords. Parametric estimation ; Variational principle ; Strauss model ; Lennard-Jones model ; Area-interaction model

1 Introduction

Gibbs point processes are popular and widely used models in spatial statistics to describe the repartition of points or geometrical structures in space. They initially arose from statistical physics where they are models for interacting continuum particles, see for instance [24]. They are now used in as different domains as astronomy, biology, computer science, ecology, forestry, image analysis and materials science. The main reason is that Gibbs point processes provide a clear interpretation of the interactions between the points, such as attraction or repulsion depending on their relative position. We refer to [2], [13], [20] and [27] for classical text books on spatial statistics and stochastic geometry, including examples and applications of Gibbs point processes.

Assuming a parametric form of the Gibbs interaction, the natural method to estimate the parameters is likelihood inference. A practical issue however is that the likelihood depends on an intractable normalizing constant, called the partition function in the statistical physics literature, that has to be approximated. Some sparse data approximations were first proposed in the 80's, e.g. in [22], before simulation-based methods have been developed [11]. A comparative simulation study carried out in [19] demonstrates that Monte Carlo approximation of the partition function provides the best results in practice. To avoid the latter approximation, other estimation methods have been introduced, including pseudolikelihood and moments based methods, see the books cited above. With modern computers, the Monte-Carlo approximation of the partition function is no longer an important issue and maximum likelihood estimation for spatial data is feasible and widely used in practice.

From a theoretical point of view, very few is known about the asymptotic properties of the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) for Gibbs point processes. The asymptotic here means that the window containing the point pattern increases to the whole space $\mathbb{R}^d$. It is commonly believed that the MLE is consistent and more efficient, at least asymptotically, than the other estimation methods. This conviction has been supported by several simulation studies, ever since [22], see also [5]. The present work is concerned with the basic question of consistency. The latter is conjectured to hold in a very general setting but no proof were so far available in the continuous case of Gibbs point processes on $\mathbb{R}^d$. This is in contrast with the discrete case of Gibbs interactions on a lattice, where consistency is established for most standard parametric models, regardless of the occurrence of phase transition (when the Gibbs measure is not unique), see [16] and [12]. In fact, the continuous case is more challenging in that most parametric Gibbs models involve irregular parameters as hardcore parameters (controlling the support of the measure) or interaction range parameters. These specificities result in a discontinuous likelihood contrast function, even asymptotically, and some further technical difficulties (for instance the true unknown Gibbs measure is not absolutely continuous with respect to the Gibbs measure associated to an estimation of the hardcore parameter). In an unpublished manuscript [18], S. Mase addressed the consistency of the MLE for superstable and regular pairwise interactions (a formal definition will be given later). His main tool was the variational principle for Gibbs processes, following the initial idea developed in the discrete case in [16]. He restricted his study to pairwise interactions that are linear in their parameters, which yields a convex contrast function. His result do not imply any restriction on the parameter space, thus including the possibility of phase transition, but the parametric interactions considered in [18] remain nonetheless rather restrictive and do not include hardcore or interaction range parameters.

We prove in this paper that the MLE is strongly consistent for a wide class of stationary Gibbs interactions, without any major restriction on the parameter space. Our assumptions include finite and infinite-body interactions with finite or infinite range, and we do not assume any continuity with respect to the parameters. Our result covers in particular the consistency of the MLE of all parameters of the Strauss model (including the range of interaction), the hardcore Strauss model (including the hardcore parameter), the Lennard-Jones model (including the exponent parameters), and the area-interaction process (including the radius of balls). An important ingredient of the proof is the variational principle, as in [16] and [18], which guarantees the identifiability of the parameters. Our original contribution is the formulation of a minimum contrast result in presence of discontinuities and, in order to apply it, new controls of physical quantities as the pressure and the mean energy with respect to the parameters.

Beyond consistency, the next natural question concerns the asymptotic distribution of the MLE. This problem is even more arduous and we do not address it in the present paper. Nonetheless, let us briefly mention the state of the art on this question. In 1992, S. Mase [17] proved that the MLE of regular parameters in a certain class of Gibbs interactions is uniform locally asymptotic normal. However his result, relying on strong cluster estimates, is established for Gibbs measure generating very sparse point patterns, which implies restrictive conditions on the parameter space. In the same period, J. Jensen [14] proved the asymptotic normality of the MLE under the Dobrushin uniqueness region, where the Gibbs process satisfies mixing properties. Here again, as noticed in [11], this assumption implies strong restrictions on the parameter space. Without these conditions, phase transition may occur and some long-range dependence phenomena can appear. The MLE might then exhibit a non standard asymptotic behavior, in the sense that the rate of convergence might differ from the standard square root of the size of the window and the limiting law might be non-gaussian. To our knowledge, the only well understood example is the estimation of the inverse temperature in the Ising model on a square lattice studied in [23]. For this example, the asymptotic law of the MLE is always Gaussian and the rate of convergence is standard except at the critical temperature where it is faster. Generalizing this result to other Gibbs models, especially in the continuous case, is hazardous. The main reason is that the occurence of phase transition is in general not well understood, and this phenomenon can be of very different nature depending on the model. Characterizing the asymptotic distribution of the MLE in a general setting of Gibbs models still remain a challenging open question.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Parametric Gibbs point processes and the MLE procedure are described in Section 2. Section 3 contains our main result, namely minimal conditions on the Gibbs interaction to ensure strong consistency of the MLE. While the latter result is established in a very general setting, we present in Section 4 standard families of models where our main result applies. Specifically, we deal with finite range pair potentials with or without hardcore (including the Strauss model and the hardcore Strauss model), infinite range pair potentials (including the Lennard-Jones model), and infinite-body interactions (including the area-interaction model). Section 5 contains the proofs of our results.

2 Gibbs point processes and the MLE

2.1 State space, reference measure and notation

We consider the continuous space $\mathbb{R}^d$ of arbitrary dimension $d \geq 1$. The Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by λ^d and the symbol Λ will always refer to a bounded Borel subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|x|$ denotes the Euclidean norm of x while for $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $|\Lambda| := \lambda^d(\Lambda)$.

A *configuration* is a subset ω of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is locally finite, meaning that $\omega \cap \Lambda$ has finite cardinality $N_\Lambda(\omega) := \#(\omega \cap \Lambda)$ for every bounded Borel set Λ. The space Ω of all configurations is equipped with the σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ generated by the counting variables N_Λ.

For convenience, we will often write ω_Λ in place of $\omega \cap \Lambda$ and ω_{Λ^c} for $\omega \cap \Lambda^c = \omega \setminus \omega_\Lambda$. Similarly for every ω and every x in ω we abbreviate $\omega \cup \{x\}$ to $\omega \cup x$ and $\omega \backslash \{x\}$ to $\omega \backslash x$.

As usual, we take the reference measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ to be the distribution π of the Poisson point process with intensity measure λ^d on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Recall that π is the unique probability measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such that the following hold for all subsets Λ: (i) N_Λ is Poisson distributed with parameter $\lambda^d(\Lambda)$, and (ii) given $N_\Lambda = n$, the n points in Λ are independent with uniform distribution on Λ. The Poisson point process restricted to Λ will be denoted by π_Λ.

Translation by a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by τ_u, either acting on $\mathbb{R}^d$ or on Ω. A probability P on Ω is said stationary if $P = P \circ \tau_u^{-1}$ for any u in $\mathbb{R}^d$. In this paper we consider only stationary probability measures P with finite intensity $E_P(N_{[0,1]^d})$, where E_P stands for the expectation with respect to P. We denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the space of such probability measures.

We denote by Δ_0, $\mathcal{I}_n$ and Λ_n the following sets

$$\Delta_0 = [0,1)^d, \quad \mathcal{I}_n = \{-n, -n+1, \ldots, n-1\}^d \quad \text{and } \Lambda_n = \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{I}_n} \tau_k(\Delta_0) = [-n, n)^d.$$

In the following, some infinite range interaction processes will be considered. To ensure their existence, we must restrict the set of configurations to the so-called set of tempered configurations as in [26]. The definition of the latter may depend on the type of interactions at hand. In case of superstable pairwise interactions, it is simply defined by

$$\Omega_T = \{\omega \in \Omega;\ \exists t > 0, \forall n \geq 1, \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} N^2_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}(\omega) \leq t(2n)^d\}.$$

Unless specified otherwise, this is the definition we consider in the sequel. From the ergodic theorem, any second order stationary measure on Ω is supported on Ω_T, so the restriction to Ω_T is a mild assumption in practice.

Several other notation are introduced throughout the next sections. For convenience to the reader, we summarize the most important of them below.

Ω, Ω_T	space of configurations, tempered configurations respectively
ω_Λ, ω_{Λ^c}	configuration ω inside Λ, outside Λ respectively
δ, θ	parameters of the interaction where δ is the hardcore parameter
I, Θ, $\mathcal{K}$	parameters space: $\delta \in I = [\delta_{\min}, \delta_{\max}]$, $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\mathcal{K} \subset \Theta$ is compact
Ω_∞^δ	space of configurations with locally finite energy
$H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega)$	energy (or Hamiltonian) of ω in Λ
$f_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}(\omega)$	conditional density of ω inside Λ, given ω_{Λ^c}, see (7)
$Z_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}$	partition function associated to the free boundary condition, see (11)
$\mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$	set of stationary Gibbs measures associated to $\omega \mapsto f_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}(\omega)$
$\mathcal{G}$	$\mathcal{G} = \cup_{\delta \in I, \theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$
ω^*	configuration associated to the true unknown parameters δ^* and θ^*
$K_n^{\delta,\theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n})$	likelihood contrast function for the observation of ω^* on Λ_n, see (9)
$H^\theta(P)$, $\mathcal{I}(P)$	mean energy and specific entropy of $P \in \mathcal{G}$, see (15) and (18)
$p(\delta, \theta)$	pressure associated to $P^{\delta,\theta} \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$, see (19)

2.2 Gibbs point processes

From a general point of view, a *family of interaction energies* is a collection $\mathcal{H} = (H_\Lambda)$, indexed by bounded Borel sets Λ, of measurable functions from Ω_T to $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that for every $\Lambda \subset \Lambda'$, there exists a measurable function $\varphi_{\Lambda,\Lambda'}$ from Ω_T to $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and for every $\omega \in \Omega_T$

$$H_{\Lambda'}(\omega) = H_\Lambda(\omega) + \varphi_{\Lambda,\Lambda'}(\omega_{\Lambda^c}). \tag{1}$$

This decomposition is equivalent to (6.11) and (6.12) in [24, p. 92]. In physical terms, $H_\Lambda(\omega) = H_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda \cup \omega_{\Lambda^c})$ represents the potential energy of the configuration ω_Λ inside Λ given the configuration ω_{Λ^c} outside Λ. In words, (1) is just a compatibility property stating that the difference between the energy on Λ' and the energy on a subset Λ only depends on the exterior configuration ω_{Λ^c}.

As explained in introduction, we aim at including a large class of interactions in our study, to cover for instance infinite-body interactions like the area-interaction process considered in Section 4.4. Nevertheless, most of standard parametric Gibbs models are pairwise interaction point processes. They are introduced below and we will come back to this important class of Gibbs models in Section 4. *Pairwise potential interactions* take the particular form

$$H_\Lambda(\omega) = z\ N_\Lambda(\omega) + \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \omega, \{x,y\} \cap \omega_\Lambda \neq \emptyset} \phi(x - y), \tag{2}$$

where $z > 0$ is the intensity parameter and ϕ is the pair potential, a function from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ which is symmetric, i.e. $\phi(-x) = \phi(x)$ for all x in $\mathbb{R}^d$. In connection with (1), if H_Λ satisfies (2), then $\varphi_{\Lambda,\Lambda'}(\omega_{\Lambda^c}) = z\ N_{\Lambda'}(\omega_{\Lambda^c}) + \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \omega_{\Lambda^c}, \{x,y\} \cap \Lambda' \neq \emptyset} \phi(x - y)$.

Let us present two well-known examples. We will use them through the paper to illustrate our notation and assumptions.

Example 1: The Strauss pair potential, defined for some possible hardcore parameter $\delta \geq 0$, some interacting parameter $\beta \geq 0$, and some range of interaction $R \geq 0$ corresponds in (2) to

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if} \quad |x| < \delta, \\ \beta & \text{if} \quad \delta \leq |x| < R, \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad |x| \geq R, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

if $R > \delta$, while $\phi(x) = \infty \mathbb{1}_{|x| < \delta}$ if $R \leq \delta$. As we will see later, the theoretical properties of this model strongly differ whether $\delta = 0$, which corresponds to the standard Strauss model, or $\delta > 0$, which is the hardcore Strauss model.

Example 2: The general Lennard-Jones (n, m) pair potential is defined for some $d < m < n$, and some $A > 0$, $B \in \mathbb{R}$ by (2) with

$$\phi(x) = A|x|^{-n} - B|x|^{-m}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{4}$$

The standard Lennard-Jones model in dimension $d = 2$ and $d = 3$ corresponds to $n = 12$ and $m = 6$.

For a family of energies $\mathcal{H} = (H_\Lambda)$, we denote by Ω_∞ the space of configurations which have a locally finite energy, i.e. $\omega \in \Omega_\infty$ if and only if, for any bounded Borel set Λ, $H_\Lambda(\omega)$ is finite.

The Gibbs measures P associated to $\mathcal{H}$ are defined through their local conditional specification, as described below. For every Λ and every ω in $\Omega_\infty \cap \Omega_T$, the conditional density f_Λ of P with respect to π_Λ is defined by

$$f_\Lambda(\omega) = \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(\omega_{\Lambda^c})} e^{-H_\Lambda(\omega)}, \tag{5}$$

where $Z_\Lambda(\omega_{\Lambda^c})$ is the normalization constant, or partition function, given by

$$Z_\Lambda(\omega_{\Lambda^c}) = \int e^{-H_\Lambda(\omega'_\Lambda \cup \omega_{\Lambda^c})} \pi_\Lambda(d\omega'_\Lambda).$$

Some regularity assumptions on $\mathcal{H}$ are required to ensure that $0 < Z_\Lambda(\omega_{\Lambda^c}) < +\infty$, implying that the local density is well-defined. They will be part of our general hypothesis in Section 3 and are fulfilled for all our examples in Section 4.

We are now in position to define the Gibbs measures associated to $\mathcal{H}$, see for instance [10].

Definition 1 *A probability measure P on Ω is a Gibbs measure for the family of energies $\mathcal{H}$ if $P(\Omega_\infty \cap \Omega_T) = 1$ and, for every bounded borel set Λ, for any measurable and integrable function g from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$,*

$$\int g(\omega) P(d\omega) = \int \int g(\omega'_\Lambda \cup \omega_{\Lambda^c}) f_\Lambda(\omega'_\Lambda \cup \omega_{\Lambda^c}) \pi_\Lambda(\mathrm{d}\omega'_\Lambda) P(d\omega). \tag{6}$$

Equivalently, for P-almost every ω the conditional law of P given ω_{Λ^c} is absolutely continuous with respect to π_Λ with the density f_Λ defined in (5).

The equations (6) are called the Dobrushin–Lanford–Ruelle (DLR) equations. Conditions on $\mathcal{H}$ are mandatory to ensure the existence of a measure P satisfying (6). For general interactions, we will later assume that both (5) is well-defined and P exists. On the other hand, the unicity of P does not necessarily hold, leading to phase transition. As explained in introduction, our consistency results are not affected by this phenomenon.

2.3 Parametric Gibbs models and the MLE procedure

We consider a parametric Gibbs model that depends on a hardcore parameter $\delta \in I$, where $I = [\delta_{\min}, \delta_{\max}]$ with $0 \le \delta_{\min} \le \delta_{\max} \le \infty$, and on a parameter $\theta \in \Theta$ with $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\Theta \neq \emptyset$. We stress the dependence on these parameters by adding some superscripts to our notation, e.g. the partition function $Z_\Lambda(\omega_{\Lambda^c})$ becomes $Z_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}(\omega_{\Lambda^c})$ and the interaction energy $H_\Lambda(\omega)$ becomes $H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega)$. In particular, the reason why we write $H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega)$ and not $H_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}(\omega)$ (and similarly for other quantities) is due to the fact that under our assumptions, the interaction energy will not depend on δ, as explained below.

Specifically we assume that the conditional density writes for any $\delta \in I$ and any $\theta \in \Theta$

$$f_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}(\omega) = \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}(\omega_{\Lambda^c})} e^{-H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega)} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty^\delta}(\omega), \quad \omega \in \Omega_T, \tag{7}$$

where

$$\omega \in \Omega_\infty^\delta \Leftrightarrow \inf_{\{x,y\} \in \omega} |x - y| \ge \delta,$$

while for any $\theta \in \Theta$ and any $\omega \in \Omega_T$, $H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega) < \infty$. This specific parametric form clearly indicates that the hardcore parameter δ only rules the support Ω^δ_∞ of the measure, and has no effect on the interaction energy H^θ_Λ. This is what happens for most models in spatial statistics, see Section 4. A counter-example is the Diggle-Gratton model [6, Section 6], where the interaction energy depends also on δ. This situation is not covered by our study.

Let $\mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$ be the set of stationary Gibbs measures defined by the conditional density (7) and with finite intensity. A minimal condition is to assume that for any value of the parameters, (7) is well-defined and that the latter set is not empty.

[**Existence**]: For any $\delta \in I$, any $\theta \in \Theta$, any bounded set Λ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and any $\omega \in \Omega^\delta_\infty \cap \Omega_T$, $Z^{\delta,\theta}_\Lambda(\omega_{\Lambda^c}) < \infty$ and the set $\mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$ is not empty.

Example 1 (continued): For the hardcore Strauss model defined in (3) with $\delta > 0$, the hardcore parameter is δ and the parameter θ corresponds to $\theta = (z, R, \beta)$. The assumption [**Existence**] for this model holds if we take $I = \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, for the standard Strauss model corresponding to the case $\delta = 0$ in (3), there is no hardcore parameter, meaning that $I = \{0\}$ and the only parameter of the model is $\theta = (z, R, \beta)$. The existence of this model, i.e. [**Existence**], holds iff θ belongs to $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Note that β needs to be nonnegative when there is no hardcore, contrary to the hardcore case. We refer to [26] for the existence results involving stable and superstable pairwise potentials, a class of interactions which includes the Strauss model.

Example 2 (continued): For the Lennard-Jones model defined in (4), there is no hardcore parameter ($\delta = 0$) and the parameter θ corresponds to $(z, A, B, n, m) \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^5$ where Θ is just defined via the constraints $z \geq 0$, $A > 0$ and $d < m < n$. The existence is also proved in [26].

Let $\delta^* \in I$ and θ^* in Θ. We denote by ω^* a realization of a Gibbs measure belonging to $\mathcal{G}^{\delta^*,\theta^*}$. The parameters δ^* and θ^* represent the true unknown parameters that we want to estimate. The MLE of (δ^*, θ^*) from the observation of ω^* on Λ_n is defined as follows.

Definition 2 *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of Θ such that $\theta^* \in \mathcal{K}$. The MLE of δ^* and θ^* from the observation of ω^* in Λ_n is defined by*

$$(\hat{\delta}_n, \hat{\theta}_n) = \underset{(\delta,\theta)\in I\times\mathcal{K}}{\operatorname{argmax}} f^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}). \tag{8}$$

In Lemma 2 below, we give sufficient conditions which ensure the existence of the argmax in (8). Let us note that we consider here the MLE with free boundary condition, meaning that the configuration $\omega^*_{\Lambda_n^c}$ outside Λ_n is not involved. This is the most natural setting given that we observe ω^* only on Λ_n. A MLE procedure that depends on the outside configuration could have been considered as well and similar theoretical results would have been proved. To implement this alternative procedure in practice yet, the interaction has to be finite range so that the outside configuration reduces to boundary effects that can be handled by minus sampling. For infinite range potentials, as considered in Section 4.3, this method is not feasible and the MLE with free boundary condition makes more sense.

We will use in the following the equivalent definition of the MLE

$$(\hat{\delta}_n, \hat{\theta}_n) = \underset{(\delta,\theta)\in I\times\mathcal{K}}{\operatorname{argmin}} K^{\delta,\theta}_n(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}),$$

where $K^{\delta,\theta}_n$ is the contrast function

$$K^{\delta,\theta}_n(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}) = \frac{\ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})}{|\Lambda_n|} + \frac{H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n})}{|\Lambda_n|} + \infty \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\delta}_n(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n})<\delta} \tag{9}$$

with

$$\tilde{\delta}_n(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) = \min_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Lambda_n}} |x-y| \tag{10}$$

and

$$Z_{\Lambda}^{\delta,\theta} = Z_{\Lambda}^{\delta,\theta}(\emptyset) = \int e^{-H_{\Lambda}^{\theta}(\omega_\Lambda)} 1\!\!\mathrm{I}_{\Omega_\infty^\delta}(\omega_\Lambda)\pi_\Lambda(d\omega_\Lambda). \tag{11}$$

In statistical mechanics, the first term in (9) is called the finite volume pressure while the second term corresponds to the specific energy.

In the following lemma we give an explicit expression for $\hat{\delta}_n$.

Lemma 1 *Under* [**Existence**]*, the MLE of the hardcore parameter δ is $\hat{\delta}_n = \tilde{\delta}_n$ if $\tilde{\delta}_n \in I$ and $\hat{\delta}_n = \delta_{\max}$ otherwise, where $\tilde{\delta}_n$ is given by* (10)*, consequently*

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \underset{\theta\in\mathcal{K}}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, K_n^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}). \tag{12}$$

Proof. If $\delta > \tilde{\delta}_n$, then $K_n^{\delta,\theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}) = \infty$ and so $\hat{\delta}_n \le \tilde{\delta}_n$. For any $\delta \le \tilde{\delta}_n$ and any $\theta \in \Theta$, $K_n^{\delta,\theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}) = |\Lambda_n|^{-1}(\ln(Z_{\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta}) + H_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}))$. Note that if $\delta < \delta'$, then $\Omega_\infty^\delta \subset \Omega_\infty^{\delta'}$ and from (11) the function $\delta \mapsto Z_{\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta}$ is decreasing. Therefore, for any $\theta \in \Theta$ and for any $\delta \le \tilde{\delta}_n$, $\delta \mapsto K_n^{\delta,\theta}(\omega^*)$ is decreasing, proving that $\hat{\delta}_n \ge \tilde{\delta}_n$. Hence $\hat{\delta}_n = \tilde{\delta}_n$ if $\tilde{\delta}_n \in I$. The other statements of Lemma 1 are straightforward. ■

This lemma provides a useful result for practical purposes, since it states that the MLE for the hardcore parameter is just the minimal distance between pairs of points observed in the pattern, as it is usually implemented. Let us remark that a crucial assumption is that the space of parameters in [**Existence**] is the cartesian product $I \times \Theta$, i.e. the parametric model is well-defined for any value of $\theta \in \Theta$, whatever δ is. This is the case for the examples considered in Section 4.

As explained in introduction, the computation of $\hat{\theta}_n$ given by (12) is more difficult because there is in general no closed form expression for $Z_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}$. In practice the optimization (12) is conducted from an approximated contrast function, based on Markov chain Monte Carlo methods where the error of approximation can be controlled, see for instance [11]. Even to ensure the existence of $\hat{\theta}_n$, we need some extra assumptions, as detailed in the following lemma.

[**Argmax**]: For any $\omega \in \Omega_T$ and any $n \ge 1$, the function $\theta \mapsto H_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})$ is lower semicontinuous over $\mathcal{K}$, i.e. for any $\theta \in \mathcal{K}$ $\liminf_{\theta'\mapsto\theta} H_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta'}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \ge H_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})$, and there exists an upper semicontinuous version $\theta \mapsto \tilde{H}_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})$ such that for every $\theta \in \mathcal{K}$, $\tilde{H}_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta} = H_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta}$ π_{Λ_n}-almost surely.

Example 1 (continued): For all $x \ne 0$, the function $\theta \mapsto \phi(x)$ in (3) is lower semicontinuous which ensures that the associated energy $\theta \mapsto H_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta}$ for the Strauss model is lower semicontinuous as well. Changing the value of ϕ at the discontinuity points, it is easy to obtain an upper semicontinuous version of the energy function which is π_{Λ_n}-almost surely equal to $H_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta}$. Therefore [**Argmax**] holds for the Strauss model.

Example 2 (continued): [**Argmax**] also holds for the Lennard-Jones model since the function $\theta \mapsto \phi(x)$ in (4) is continuous for any $x \ne 0$.

Lemma 2 *Under* [**Existence**] *and* [**Argmax**]*, the MLE of θ exists, i.e. there exists at least one $\hat{\theta}_n \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $K_n^{\hat{\delta}_n,\hat{\theta}_n}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}) = \min_{\theta\in\mathcal{K}} K_n^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n})$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that $\theta \mapsto K_n^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n})$ is lower semicontinuous. As a direct consequence of [**Argmax**], $\theta \mapsto H_{\Lambda_n}^{\theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n})$ is lower semicontinuous. For the finite volume pressure, this comes from [**Argmax**] and the Fatou's lemma since

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{\theta'\mapsto\theta} Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta'}_{\Lambda_n} &= \liminf_{\theta'\mapsto\theta} \int e^{-\tilde{H}^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^{\hat{\delta}_n}_{\infty}}(\omega_\Lambda)\pi_{\Lambda_n}(d\omega_{\Lambda_n})\\ &\geq \int \liminf_{\theta'\mapsto\theta} e^{-\tilde{H}^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^{\hat{\delta}_n}_{\infty}}(\omega_\Lambda)\pi_{\Lambda_n}(d\omega_{\Lambda_n})\\ &\geq \int e^{-\tilde{H}^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^{\hat{\delta}_n}_{\infty}}(\omega_\Lambda)\pi_{\Lambda_n}(d\omega_{\Lambda_n}) = Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}.\end{aligned}$$

■

3 Consistency of the MLE for general Gibbs interactions

We detail in this section the minimal assumptions on the parametric family of Gibbs measure that imply the strong consistency of the MLE. All of them are fulfilled by the examples of Section 4.

The first ones, [**Existence**] and [**Argmax**] introduced in the previous section, imply the existence of a Gibbs measure for any $\delta \in I$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, and the existence of the MLE.

We assume the following mild assumptions on the family of energies. They gather the stability of the energy function, a standard stationary decomposition in terms of mean energy per unit volume and they deal with boundary effects. We put $\mathcal{G} = \cup_{\delta\in I,\theta\in\Theta}\mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$.

[**Stability**]: For any compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \Theta$, there exists a constant $\kappa \geq 0$ such that for any Λ, any $\theta \in \mathcal{K}$ and any $\omega \in \Omega_T$

$$H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda) \geq -\kappa N_\Lambda(\omega). \tag{13}$$

[**MeanEnergy**]: There exist measurable functions H^θ_0 and ∂H^θ_n from Ω_T to $\mathbb{R}$ such that for all $n \geq 1$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$

$$H^\theta_{\Lambda_n} = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}_n} H^\theta_0 \circ \tau_{-k} + \partial H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}, \tag{14}$$

where for all $P \in \mathcal{G}$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$ the *mean energy* of P defined by

$$H^\theta(P) = E_P(H^\theta_0) \tag{15}$$

is finite and for any compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \Theta$, for P-almost every $\omega \in \Omega_T$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{K}} \left|\partial H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega)\right| = 0.$$

[**Boundary**]: For all $P \in \mathcal{G}$, for any compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \Theta$ and for P-almost every $\omega \in \Omega_T$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{K}} \left|H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) - H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega)\right| = 0.$$

To prove the consistency of the MLE, we need to control the asymptotic behaviour of the finite volume pressure and the specific energy in (9). The following assumption deals with the latter.

[**Regularity**]: For any P in $\mathcal{G}$, for any compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \Theta$, there exists a function g from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}_+$ with $\lim_{r\to 0} g(r) = 0$ such that for any $\theta \in \mathcal{K}$ and any $r > 0$

$$E_P\left(\sup_{\substack{\theta'\in\mathcal{K}\\|\theta-\theta'|\leq r}} \left|H^\theta_0 - H^{\theta'}_0\right|\right) \leq g(r). \tag{16}$$

Moreover there exists a bounded subset Λ_0 such that for any $\eta > 0$ and any $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists a finite subset $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0) \subset B(\theta_0, \eta) \cap \Theta$ and $r(\theta_0) > 0$ such that $r(\theta_0) < \eta$ and for any $\Lambda \supset \Lambda_0$,

$$\max_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}(\theta_0)} \inf_{\theta' \in B(\theta_0, r(\theta_0)) \cap \mathcal{K}} \inf_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Omega_\infty^{\delta_{\min}}} \left(\frac{H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega_\Lambda) - H_\Lambda^{\theta'}(\omega_\Lambda)}{N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)} \right) \geq -g(r(\theta_0)). \tag{17}$$

Assumption (16) implies in particular that the mean energy $H^\theta(P)$ is continuous with respect to θ. Let us note that this does not imply that the specific energy or $\theta \mapsto H_0^\theta$ is continuous with respect to θ. As a counterexample, the Strauss model in Example 1, or more generally any model from Sections 4.1 and 4.2, has a discontinuous specific energy but the mean energy is continuous, which is verified in the proof of Theorem 2. Assumption (17) is related to the regularity of the coefficient κ in [**Stability**] with respect to the parameter θ.

Finally the following assumption relates the pressure and the specific entropy defined below, through the variational principle. The variational principle is conjectured to hold for all models of statistical mechanics even if it is not proved in such a general setting. It is established for stable and finite-range interactions in [4] and for infinite-range pair potentials that are regular and non-integrably divergent at the origin in [8, 9].

For any $\delta \in I$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, the *specific entropy* of $P^{\delta,\theta} \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$ is the limit

$$\mathcal{I}(P^{\delta,\theta}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \mathcal{I}_{\Lambda_n}(P^{\delta,\theta}) \tag{18}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{\Lambda_n}(P^{\delta,\theta}) = \int \ln f_{\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) P_{\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta}(d\omega)$ is the finite volume entropy of $P^{\delta,\theta}$. Note that this limit always exists, see [10].

[**VarPrin**]: For any $\delta \in I$ and any $\theta \in \Theta$, the *pressure* defined as the following limit exists and is finite

$$p(\delta, \theta) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \ln(Z_{\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta}). \tag{19}$$

Moreover the map $\delta \mapsto p(\delta, \theta)$ is right continuous on I, i.e. $\lim_{\delta' \to \delta, \delta' \geq \delta} p(\delta', \theta) = p(\delta, \theta)$. In addition, for any δ, δ' in I with $\delta' \geq \delta$, for any θ, θ' in Θ, for all $P^{\delta',\theta'} \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta',\theta'}$ the inequality

$$p(\delta, \theta) \geq -\mathcal{I}(P^{\delta',\theta'}) - H^\theta(P^{\delta',\theta'}) \tag{20}$$

holds. If $(\delta', \theta') = (\delta^*, \theta^*)$, then equality holds in (20) if and only if $(\delta, \theta) = (\delta^*, \theta^*)$.

The formulation of the variational principle presented here is slightly weaker than the classical one in statistical mechanics where the inequality (20) is required for any probability measure P on Ω_T, and not only for $P^{\delta',\theta'} \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta',\theta'}$. Note that the right continuity of the pressure holds trivially when δ^* is known, i.e. $I = \{\delta^*\}$. Let us also remark that the last part in [**VarPrin**] concerning (δ^*, θ^*) is just an identifiability assumption.

We are now in position to state the consistency of the MLE.

Theorem 1 *Under the assumptions* [**Existence**], [**Argmax**], [**Stability**], [**MeanEnergy**], [**Boundary**], [**Regularity**] *and* [**VarPrin**], *for any* $(\delta^*, \theta^*) \in I \times \mathcal{K}$ *and any* $P \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta^*,\theta^*}$, *the MLE* $(\hat{\delta}_n, \hat{\theta}_n)$ *is well-defined and converges* P*-almost surely to* (δ^*, θ^*) *when* n *goes to infinity.*

Example 1 (continued): The Strauss and the hardcore Strauss models satisfy all the assumptions of Theorem 1 which ensures the consistency of the MLE of δ^*, β^* and R^*. The assumptions [**Existence**] and [**Argmax**] have already been discussed earlier and the stability assumption is obvious here since $\phi \geq 0$. The assumptions [**MeanEnergy**] and [**VarPrin**] involve a variational characterisation of infinite volume Gibbs measures which is standard in statistical mechanics [4]. On the contrary, [**Regularity**] is a technical assumption which is specific to the study of consistency of the MLE. Its proof is given in Section 5.3 when the hardcore parameter δ^* is positive and in Section 5.4 when $\delta^* = 0$. Note that the Strauss model belongs to the large class of finite range pairwise interactions developed in details in Sections 4.1 and 4.2.

Example 2 (continued): The Lennard-Jones model also satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1. The assumptions [**Existence**] and [**Argmax**] have been checked in Section 2.3. The stability assumption is already known, see for instance Section 3.2 in [25], and is proved using the theory of positive type functions and Bochner's theorem. The assumptions [**MeanEnergy**] and [**VarPrin**] are proved in [8], [9] which deal with the variational principle in the general setting of infinite range pairwise interactions. Again the [**Regularity**] assumption is more specific and requires fine computations given in Section 5.5. Note finally that the Lennard Jones model belongs to the class of infinite range pairwise interactions studied in Section 4.3.

As illustrated in the two examples above, all the assumptions of Theorem 1, excepted [**Regularity**], are natural and standard in statistical mechanics. They generally do not require much efforts to be checked since they are already proved for many models in the literature. In fact, only Assumption [**Regularity**] is really specific to the study of consistency of the MLE and needs a particular attention. Its proof strongly depends on the underlying model. Nonetheless, the techniques we develop in Sections 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 in the cases of the Strauss, the hardcore Strauss and the Lennard Jones models (and their generalizations) provide tools and strategies to deal with it. We think that they could be easily extended to the study of other models.

As a noticeable example stated in the following corollary, if the energy H_Λ^θ depends linearly on the parameter θ, which is called the exponential model, then the assumptions [**Argmax**] and [**Regularity**] are automatically satisfied. Specifically, for any $1 \leq k \leq p$, let (H_Λ^k) be a family of interaction energies satisfying (1). For any $\theta \in \Theta$ and any bounded set Λ an exponential model takes the form

$$H_\Lambda^\theta = \sum_{k=1}^{p} \theta_k H_\Lambda^k. \tag{21}$$

Let us introduce the following modification of [**MeanEnergy**].

[**MeanEnergy'**]: The assumption [**MeanEnergy**] holds with $H_0^\theta = \sum_{k=1}^p \theta_k H_0^k$ where H_0^k comes from the decomposition (14) applied to $H_{\Lambda_n}^k$.

Corollary 1 *Assume that the family of interaction energies satisfy* (21) *and that* Θ *is an open subset of* $\mathbb{R}^p$. *Then under the assumptions* [**Existence**], [**Stability**], [**MeanEnergy'**], [**Boundary**] *and* [**VarPrin**], *for any* $(\delta^*, \theta^*) \in I \times \mathcal{K}$ *and any* $P \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta^*,\theta^*}$, *the MLE* $(\hat{\delta}_n, \hat{\theta}_n)$ *is well-defined and converges* P*-almost surely to* (δ^*, θ^*) *when* n *goes to infinity.*

Remark 1 *In Theorem 1, there is no topological assumption on the set* Θ *except that* $\Theta \neq \emptyset$. *However, for identifiability reasons or in order to check* [**Regularity**], *some assumptions on* Θ *will often come out, depending on the model. This is illustrated in Corollary 1 where we assume* Θ *to be an open set. This assumption is usual and will still be used in the specific examples of the next section. Nevertheless this hypothesis is in general not necessary for consistency. For some models, it is possible to check all assumptions of Theorem 1 when* Θ *is not open and* θ^* *is on the boundary of* Θ. *As an example, it is not difficult to prove that the estimation of* $\beta^* = 0$ *in the Strauss model (where* $\delta^* = 0$ *and* R^* *is known) is consistent, in which case* $\theta = \beta$, $\Theta = [0, \infty)$ *and* (21) *is satisfied. This can be done as in the proof of Corollary 1, where the assumption* (17) *in* [**Regularity**] *is verified by taking, for any* $\eta > 0$ *and* $\beta_0 \geq 0$, $\mathcal{N}(\beta_0) = \{\beta_0 + \eta/2\}$ *and* $r < \eta/2$. *Note that the same conclusion is not true if in this model we try to estimate both* β^* *and* R^* *when* $\beta^* = 0$, *because then* R^* *is not identifiable. Finally, the study of consistency for parameters on the boundary of* Θ *is specific to the model at hand and it is difficult to draw general results in this case.*

4 Consistency for pairwise interactions and other examples

4.1 Finite range piecewise continuous pair potentials with hardcore

In this section, we illustrate how the general result of Theorem 1 applies to the class of finite-range pairwise interactions with hardcore. The following framework gathers all potentials of this type described in [2], [13], [20] and [27], including the hardcore Strauss model of Example 1 (detailed at the end of this section in Corollary 2), the hardcore piecewise constant pairwise interaction model and the Fiksel model.

Specifically, we consider conditional densities given by (7) with a non-vanishing hardcore parameter, i.e. $\delta_{\min} > 0$, and a Hamiltonian H^θ_Λ defined as in (2) by

$$H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega) = z\, N_\Lambda(\omega) + \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega, \{x,y\}\cap\omega_\Lambda\neq\emptyset} \phi^{\beta,R}(x-y), \tag{22}$$

where $z > 0$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $R = (R_1, \dots, R_q)$ is a multidimensional interaction parameter in $\mathbb{R}^q$ belonging to the subset $\mathcal{R} = \{R \in \mathbb{R}^q,\ 0 < R_1 < \cdots < R_q\}$. The pair potential interaction $\phi^{\beta,R}$ is defined piecewise as follows. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\phi^{\beta,R}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_{[0,R_1)}(|x|)\, \varphi_1^{\beta,R}(|x|) + \cdots + \mathbb{1}_{(R_{q-1},R_q)}(|x|)\, \varphi_q^{\beta,R}(|x|), & \text{if } |x| \neq R_1, R_2, \dots, R_q, \\ \min(\varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x|), \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta,R}(|x|)), & \text{if } |x| = R_k \text{ for some } k, \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

with the convention $\varphi_{q+1}^{\beta,R} = 0$. For any $k = 1, \dots, q$, we assume that there exists an open subset $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathbb{R}^p$ such that

$$(\beta, R, x) \mapsto \varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x|) \text{ is continuous on } \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{24}$$

Note that from (23) and (24), the function $(\beta, R) \mapsto \phi^{\beta,R}(x)$ is lower semicontinuous which is crucial for the assumption **[Argmax]**.

In this setting, the parameters to estimate are δ^* and $\theta = (z^*, \beta^*, R^*)$ that we assume belong to $I = [\delta_{\min}, \infty)$ and $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{R}$, respectively. For identifiability reasons, we further assume that

$$R_1^* > \delta^* \quad \text{ and } \quad \lambda^d\left(x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{1}_{[\delta^*,+\infty)}(|x|)\left(\phi^{\beta^*,R^*}(x) - \phi^{\beta,R}(x)\right) \neq 0\right) > 0 \tag{25}$$

for any $(\beta, R) \neq (\beta^*, R^*)$. This implies that if $(\delta, \theta) \neq (\delta^*, \theta^*)$ then $\mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta} \cap \mathcal{G}^{\delta^*,\theta^*} = \emptyset$.

Notice that the assumption $R_1^* > \delta^*$ is necessary to ensure identifiability of R^* and δ^*, but we do not need to add the constraint $R_1 > \delta$ in the MLE optimisation (8), as confirmed by the choice of $\mathcal{K}$ in the theorem below. This is in particular important to agree with the setting of Lemma 1, where it is necessary that the optimisation (8) is carried out on a cartesian product $I \times \mathcal{K}$.

Theorem 2 *Consider the Gibbs model defined by* (7) *with the Hamiltonian* (22) *and the pair potential* (23)*, under the assumptions* $\delta_{\min} > 0$*,* (24) *and* (25)*. Let* $\mathcal{K}$ *be a compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{R}$ *such that* $(z^*, \beta^*, R^*) \in \mathcal{K}$*. Then the MLE of* $(\delta^*, z^*, \beta^*, R^*)$ *given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

Corollary 2 (Hardcore Strauss model) *Consider the hardcore Strauss model of Example 1 with parameters* $\delta^* \geq \delta_{\min}$ *where* $\delta_{\min} > 0$*,* $z^* > 0$*,* $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $R^* > \delta^*$*. Let* $\mathcal{K}$ *be a compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ *such that* $(z^*, \beta^*, R^*) \in \mathcal{K}$*. Then the MLE of* $(\delta^*, z^*, \beta^*, R^*)$ *given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

Proof. The hardcore Strauss model corresponds to the Hamiltonian (22) and the pair potential (23) where $q = p = 1$ and $\varphi_1^{\beta,R} \equiv \beta$. In this setting $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{R}_+$. The assumptions (24) and (25) thus hold trivially true for $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{R}$ and Theorem 2 applies. ■

4.2 Finite range piecewise continuous pair potentials without hardcore

We consider the same setting as in the previous section except that there is no hardcore, i.e. $\delta^* = 0$ and δ^* is known, meaning that it has not to be fitted, or equivalently $\delta_{\min} = \delta_{\max} = 0$ implying $I = \{0\}$ in (8). The Hamiltonian H_Λ^θ is defined as in (22) and (23) with the same continuity assumptions (24). The standard example we have in mind for this section is the Strauss model of Example 1 or any of the examples mentioned in the previous section without assuming the presence of a hardcore part.

Whereas this setting may appear to be simpler than the previous one from a statistical point of view (there is one parameter less to fit), it requires additional assumptions to ensure the existence of the model and to control its regularity. This has been already pointed out for the Strauss model of Example 1 after the statement of [**Existence**]. Consequently, we further assume that the Hamiltonian H_Λ^θ satisfies [**Stability**] and that for any (β, R) the pair potential $\phi^{\beta,R}$ is superstable, which means that it is the sum of a stable pair potential plus a non negative potential which is positive around zero (see [26]). The identifiability assumptions remain similar as in the previous section, that (25) with $\delta^* = 0$.

To handle the second part of [**Regularity**], we need a last hypothesis on the potential function. We assume that for any $(\beta_0, R_0) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{R}$ and any $\eta > 0$ there exists $\beta_1 \in B(\beta_0, \eta) \cap \mathcal{B}$ such that for any $k = 1, \ldots, q$

$$\varphi_k^{\beta_1, R_0} > \varphi_k^{\beta_0, R_0}. \tag{26}$$

Theorem 3 *Consider the Gibbs model defined by* (7) *with the Hamiltonian* (22) *and the pair potential* (23)*, under the assumptions* $\delta_{\min} = \delta_{\max} = 0$*,* (24) *and* (25) *where* $\delta^* = 0$*. Assume further that the pair potential* $\phi^{\beta,R}$ *is superstable and* (26)*. Let* $\mathcal{K}$ *be a compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{R}$ *such that* $(z^*, \beta^*, R^*) \in \mathcal{K}$*. Then the MLE of* (z^*, β^*, R^*) *given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

This theorem can be easily applied to all standard finite range pairwise potentials (without hardcore) described in [2], [13], [20] and [27]. In particular, condition (26) turns out to be non-restrictive. Because of its central role in spatial statistics, we focus in the following corollary on the Strauss model of Example 1.

Corollary 3 (Strauss model) *Consider the Strauss model of Example 1 with parameters* $z^* > 0$*,* $\beta^* > 0$*,* $R^* > 0$ *and there is no hardcore, i.e.* $\delta^* = 0$ *is known. Let* $\mathcal{K}$ *be a compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}_+^3$ *such that* $(z^*, \beta^*, R^*) \in \mathcal{K}$*. Then the MLE of* (z^*, β^*, R^*) *given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

Proof. Recall that the Strauss model corresponds in (23) to $q = p = 1$ and $\varphi_1^{\beta,R} \equiv \beta$. As in the proof of Corollary 2, the assumptions (24) and (25) (where $\delta^* = 0$) hold true with the choice $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Moreover the associated pair potential $\phi^{\beta,R}$ is positive for any $\beta > 0$ and $R > 0$, which shows that it is superstable and that [**Stability**] holds true. Finally the assumption (26) is verified if we choose $\beta_1 > \beta_0$. Therefore Theorem 3 applies. ■

4.3 Infinite range pair potentials with a smooth parametrization

In this section, we consider pairwise models in the spirit of the Lennard-Jones model given in Example 2. Our general setting concerns infinite range pair potentials without hardcore, i.e. $\delta_{\min} = \delta_{\max} = 0$, that are uniformly regular and non-integrably divergent at the origin in the sense of Ruelle [26]. Specifically, we assume that there exist two positive decreasing functions ψ and χ from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}$ and $r_0 > 0$ with

$$\int_{r_0}^{+\infty} \psi(t) t^{d-1} dt < \infty, \qquad \int_0^{r_0} \chi(t) t^{d-1} dt = +\infty$$

such that for any parameter $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^p$, the function $\phi^\beta : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\phi^\beta(x) \geq \chi(|x|) \text{ whenever } |x| \leq r_0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\phi^\beta(x)| \leq \psi(|x|) \text{ whenever } |x| > r_0. \tag{27}$$

The Hamiltonian H_Λ^θ is defined as in (2) by

$$H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega) = z\, N_\Lambda(\omega) + \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega, \{x,y\}\cap\omega_\Lambda\neq\emptyset} \phi^\beta(x-y), \tag{28}$$

where $\theta = (z, \beta)$ is in $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{B}$.

We assume that ϕ^β is a symmetric function on $\mathbb{R}^d\backslash\{0\}$ and that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d\backslash\{0\}$, the map $\beta \mapsto \phi^\beta(x)$ is differentiable on $\mathcal{B}$. Denoting by $\nabla\phi^\beta(x)$ its gradient, we also assume that for any compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{B}$, for any $\beta \in \mathcal{K}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|x| > r_0$

$$|\nabla\phi^\beta(x)| \leq \psi(|x|) \tag{29}$$

and

$$\sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{|x|\leq r_0} \sup_{\beta'\in\mathcal{K}} e^{-\phi^{\beta'}(x)} \max(\phi^\beta(x), |\nabla\phi^\beta(x)|) < \infty. \tag{30}$$

In addition we suppose that for any compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{B}$ there exists an open set U in $\mathbb{R}^p$ and a stable pair potential $\tilde{\phi}$ from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that for any $u \in U$, any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $\beta \in \mathcal{K}$

$$\nabla\phi^\beta(x).u \geq \tilde{\phi}(x), \tag{31}$$

where $v.u$ denotes the scalar product of vectors u, v in $\mathbb{R}^p$.

Finally, for identifiability reasons, we assume that for any $\beta \neq \beta'$ in $\mathcal{B}$,

$$\lambda^d\left(x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \phi^\beta(x) \neq \phi^{\beta'}(x)\right) > 0. \tag{32}$$

Theorem 4 *Let $(\phi^\beta)_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}}$ be a family of pair potentials which are uniformly regular, non-integrably divergent at the origin and satisfy assumptions* (29)-(32). *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of Θ such that $\theta^* = (z^*, \beta^*)$ belongs to $\mathcal{K}$. Then the MLE of (z^*, β^*) given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

As a fundamental example, the following corollary focuses on the Lennard-Jones model of Example 2. Let the triangle domain $\mathcal{T} = \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{R}^2, d < m < n\}$.

Corollary 4 (Lennard-Jones model) *Consider the Lennard-Jones model of Example 2 given by* (28) *and* (4) *with parameters $z > 0$ and $\beta = (A, B, n, m) \in \mathcal{B}$ where $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{T}$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{B}$ such that $(z^*, \beta^*) \in \mathcal{K}$. Then the MLE of (z^*, β^*) given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

Proof. Denote by $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}$ the projection of $\mathcal{K}$ onto $\mathcal{T}$, i.e. $(n, m) \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}$ if and only if there exists $z > 0$, $A > 0$ and B such that $(z, A, B, n, m) \in \mathcal{K}$. It is easy to find $r_0 > 0$ and two positive constants c_0, c_1 such that ϕ^β given by (4) is uniformly regular and non-integrably divergent at the origin for r_0, $\psi(t) = c_0 t^{-m_0}$ and $\chi(t) = t^{-n_0}$ with $d < m_0 < m$ and $d < n_0 < n$ for all $(n, m) \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{T}$.

The map $\beta \mapsto \phi^\beta$ is clearly differentiable on $\mathcal{B}$ with

$$\nabla\phi^\beta(x) = \left(|x|^{-n}, |x|^{-m}, -A\ln(|x|)|x|^{-n}, B\ln(|x|)|x|^{-m}\right).$$

In adjusting the constant c_0 in the definition of ψ, we show that assumption (29) holds. Assumptions (30) and (32) are obvious. It remains to show (31). Let u_0 be the vector $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ in $\mathbb{R}^4$ and u any vector in the open ball $B(u_0, 1/2)$ in $\mathbb{R}^4$. Denoting $\mathcal{K}_\mathcal{B}$ the projection of $\mathcal{K}$ onto $\mathcal{B}$, we find that for any $\beta \in \mathcal{K}_\mathcal{B}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\nabla\phi^\beta(x).u \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(|x|)\Big(|x|^{-n} - |b_0\ln(|x|)||x|^{-m}\Big) - \frac{3}{2}\mathbb{1}_{(1,+\infty)}(|x|)(a_1 + |b_1|)\ln(|x|)|x|^{-m}$$

where a_1, b_0 and b_1 are chosen so that for any A and B, $A < a_1$ and $b_0 < B < b_1$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $(n, m) \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{T}}$, $m < n - \delta$, whereby

$$\nabla\phi^\beta(x).u \geq c1\!\!1_{[0,1]}(|x|)|x|^{-n_0} - c1\!\!1_{(1,+\infty)}(|x|)\ln(|x|)|x|^{-m_0}$$

for some $c > 0$. The right hand term of this inequality is regular non-integrably divergent at the origin. Therefore it is stable and (31) is proved. ■

We can also deduce from Theorem 4 the same kind of result as in [18] concerning exponential models. Note however that the proof in [18] crucially relies on the convexity of $\beta \mapsto \phi^\beta(x)$, whereas the following corollary is obtained by different techniques.

Corollary 5 *Assume that in* (28) *the family of pair potentials* $(\phi^\beta)_{\beta\in\mathcal{B}}$ *is uniformly regular, non-integrably divergent at the origin, satisfies the identifiability condition* (32) *and that*

$$\phi^\beta(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \beta_i \phi_i(x)$$

where $\phi_1(x) \geq \chi(|x|)$ *if* $|x| < r_0$ *while for* $i \geq 2$, $\phi_i(x) = o(\phi_1(x))$ *when* $x \to 0$. *Let* $\mathcal{K}$ *be a compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{B}$ *such that* $\theta^* = (z^*, \beta^*)$ *belongs to* $\mathcal{K}$. *Then the MLE of* (z^*, β^*) *given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

Proof. In view of Theorem 4, we just need to check (29)-(31). Let $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p) \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\beta' = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{p-1}, \beta'_p) \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\beta'_p \neq \beta_p$. Since ϕ^β is uniformly regular, we have $|\phi^\beta(x) - \phi^{\beta'}(x)| \leq 2\psi(|x|)$, meaning that $|\phi_p(x)| \leq c\psi(|x|)$ for some $c > 0$. We obtain likewise $|\phi_i(x)| \leq c\psi(|x|)$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, p$. Consequenlty $|\nabla\phi^\beta(x)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{p} |\phi_i(x)| \leq pc\Psi(|x|)$ and (29) is proved.

The relation (30) holds trivially true by choosing r_0 sufficiently small. Finally, letting U be any open set included in $\mathcal{K}$, we have $\nabla\phi^\beta(x).u = \phi^u(x)$ which is stable by assumption. ■

4.4 Examples of infinite-body interactions

Our general result in Theorem 1 is also adapted to non-pairwise potential models. For instance, it is not difficult to generalize the results of the three previous sections to the case of a finite-body interaction of order greater than two, as for instance a triplet or quadruplet interaction. For brevity reasons, we do not include this generalization in the present paper. Instead, we give in this section examples arising from stochastic geometry which involve infinite-body interactions. Specifically, we focus on the area-interaction and the Quermass-interaction processes, but other models could have been considered as well.

The area-interaction process [1], also called Widom-Rowlinson model in the statistical physics community [29], is probably the most popular model of infinite-body interaction. For $R \geq 0$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and Λ a bounded set in $\mathbb{R}^d$, we introduce the notation

$$\mathcal{A}^R(\omega_\Lambda) = \lambda^d \left(\bigcup_{x\in\omega_\Lambda} B(x, R) \right).$$

The Hamiltonian H_Λ^θ of the area-interaction process is defined for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and any bounded set Λ by

$$H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega) = zN_\Lambda(\omega) + \beta\left(\mathcal{A}^R\left(\omega_{\Lambda\oplus B(0,2R)}\right) - \mathcal{A}^R\left(\omega_{\Lambda\oplus B(0,2R)\setminus\Lambda}\right)\right), \tag{33}$$

where the parameter $\theta = (z, R, \beta)$ belongs to $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ and the operator $\oplus$ stands for the Minkowski sum acting on the sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Note that the unknown radius R is part of the parameters and is estimated consistently as stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 1 *Let* $\mathcal{H} = (H^\theta)_\Lambda$ *be the family of area-interaction energies defined in* (33) *and* $\mathcal{K}$ *a compact subset of* Θ *such that* $\theta^* = (z^*, R^*, \beta^*)$ *belongs to* $\mathcal{K}$. *Then the MLE of* θ^* *given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

The Quermass-interaction model is a generalization of the area-interaction process, where not only the volume of the union of balls is involved in the Hamiltonian but also the other Minkowski functionals. We denote by M_k, $k = 1 \dots d+1$, the $d+1$ Minkowski functionals in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and for short

$$\mathcal{M}_k^R(\omega_\Lambda) = M_k \left(\bigcup_{x \in \omega_\Lambda} B(x, R) \right),$$

where $R \geq 0$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and Λ is a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Recall that for $d = 2$, M_1 corresponds to the Euler-Poincaré characteristic, M_2 is the perimeter and M_3 is the area. We refer to [2] for more details about Minkowski functionals.

The Hamiltonian H_Λ^θ of the Quermass-interaction process is defined for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and any bounded set Λ by

$$H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega) = zN_\Lambda(\omega) + \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} \beta_k \left(\mathcal{M}_k^R \left(\omega_{\Lambda \oplus B(0,2R)} \right) - \mathcal{M}_k^R \left(\omega_{\Lambda \oplus B(0,2R) \setminus \Lambda} \right) \right) \tag{34}$$

where $R \geq 0$, $z > 0$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

This model has been introduced in [15]. Its existence on $\mathbb{R}^d$ has been solved so far only when $d \leq 2$ in [3]. Therefore we restrict the following study to the case $d \leq 2$. Moreover, we assume that R is known and we only consider the MLE estimation of $\theta := (z, \beta)$ in (34). The reason is that we did not succeed to prove that (17) in [**Regularity**] holds in presence of the Euler-Poincaré characteristic M_1 when R is part of the unknown parameter. With the assumption that R is known, the Quermass-interaction process becomes an infinite-body interactions exponential model and Corollary 1 applies. In this framework the set of parameters is $\Theta = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3$.

Proposition 2 *Let $\mathcal{H} = (H^\theta)_\Lambda$ be the family of Quermass-interaction energies defined in* (34) *for $d = 2$ and let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of Θ such that $\theta^* = (z^*, \beta^*)$ belongs to $\mathcal{K}$. Then the MLE of θ^* given by* (8) *is strongly consistent.*

5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof is organised as follows. In a first step (Lemma 3), we show that the hardcore parameter $\hat{\delta}_n$ converges to δ^*. So, according to Lemma 2, it remains to prove that the minimizer of $\theta \to K_n^{\hat{\delta}_n, \theta}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}^*)$ converges to θ^*. This result is guaranteed via a general lemma on the convergence of minimizers of possibly non regular contrast functions (Lemma 4). The final step of the proof therefore consists in checking the assumptions of this lemma, namely

- the almost sure convergence of the contrast functions to a lower semicontinuous function admitting θ^* as a minimizer (assumptions *i*), *ii*), *iv*) of Lemma 4),
- the control, when n goes to infinity, of the infimum of contrast functions evaluated on small balls with respect to the minimum of contrast functions evaluated only on a finite number of points (assumption *v*)).

Note that Lemma 4 and the verification of its assumptions in the setting of Theorem 1 and for all models considered in Section 4 are the main contributions of the present paper.

Let us now enter into the details of the proof. Let P be a probability measure in $\mathcal{G}^{\delta^*, \theta^*}$ and let ω^* be a realisation of P. If P is not ergodic, it can be represented as the mixture of ergodic stationary Gibbs measures, see [24]. Therefore the proof of the consistency of the MLE reduces to the case when P is ergodic, which is assumed henceforth.

Let us start by proving the convergence of the hardcore parameter.

Lemma 3 *The MLE $\hat{\delta}_n$ converges P-almost surely to δ^* when n goes to infinity.*

Proof. From Lemma 1, $\hat{\delta}_n = \min(\tilde{\delta}_n, \delta_{\max})$ where $\tilde{\delta}_n$ is given by (10). Clearly $\tilde{\delta}_n$ is a decreasing sequence and $\tilde{\delta}_n \geq \delta^*$. So it remains to prove that, for any $\delta' > \delta^*$, $\tilde{\delta}_n$ is smaller than δ' for n large enough. By the DLR equations (6) and the definition of local densities (7), there exists a bounded set Λ such that

$$P(\text{there exist } \ x, y \in \omega_\Lambda \text{ such that } \delta^* < |x-y| < \delta') > 0.$$

Thanks to the ergodic theorem, this implies that

$$P(\text{there exist } n \geq 1 \text{ and } x, y \in \omega_{\Lambda_n} \text{ such that } \delta^* < |x-y| < \delta') = 1$$

which proves the expected result. ■

According to Lemmas 2 and 3, we have now to prove the consistency of $\hat{\theta}_n$ where

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \text{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathcal{K}} K_n^{\hat{\delta}_n, \theta}(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}).$$

The strong consistency relies on a minimum contrast function result stated in the next lemma, where neither the contrast function nor its limit need to be continuous with respect to θ.

Lemma 4 *For any $\theta \in \Theta$, let $(h_n^\theta)_{n\geq 1}$ be a family of parametric measurable functions from Ω_T to $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of Θ and let P be a probability measure on Ω_T. We assume that*

i) For any $\theta \in \Theta$, h_n^θ converges P-almost surely to a finite real number (denoted by h^θ) when n goes to infinity.

ii) The function $\theta \mapsto h^\theta$ admits a unique minimum over Θ:

$$\theta^* = \mathit{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} h^\theta,$$

and $\theta^* \in \mathcal{K}$.

iii) For P-almost every $\omega \in \Omega_T$ and for n sufficiently large, $\theta \mapsto h_n^\theta$ admits an infimum over $\mathcal{K}$ attained by at least one element $\hat{\theta}_n(\omega)$.

iv) The function $\theta \mapsto h^\theta$ is lower semicontinuous on Θ (i.e. for any $\theta \in \Theta$, $\liminf_{\theta' \mapsto \theta} h^{\theta'} \geq h^\theta$).

v) There exists a function g_0 from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying

$$\lim_{x \mapsto 0} g_0(x) = 0$$

and such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for any $\theta \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists a finite subset $\mathcal{N}(\theta)$ included in $B(\theta, g_0(\varepsilon)) \cap \Theta$ and $r(\theta) > 0$ such that

$$P\left(\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left(\min_{\theta' \in \mathcal{N}(\theta)} h_n^{\theta'} - \inf_{\theta' \in B(\theta, r(\theta)) \cap \mathcal{K}} h_n^{\theta'}\right) \geq \varepsilon\right) = 0. \tag{35}$$

Then the sequence $\hat{\theta}_n = \mathit{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathcal{K}} h_n(\theta)$ converges P-almost surely to θ^* when n goes to infinity.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and A_ε be the following set

$$A_\varepsilon = \left\{\theta \in \mathcal{K} \oplus \bar{B}(0, g_0(\varepsilon)) \text{ such that } h^\theta \leq h^{\theta^*} + 2\varepsilon\right\},$$

where g_0 comes from *v)* and $\bar{B}(0, g_0(\varepsilon))$ denotes the closure of the ball $B(0, g_0(\varepsilon))$. By *iv)* the function $\theta \mapsto h^\theta$ is lower semicontinuous and so the set A_ε is a compact set. Moreover by *ii)*,

$$\{\theta^*\} = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} A_\varepsilon. \tag{36}$$

We deduce that the diameter of A_ε goes to zero when ε goes to zero. Let us consider the set $B_\varepsilon := A_\varepsilon \oplus B(0, g_0(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon)$. Clearly its diameter tends to zero as well. So to prove that $(\hat{\theta}_n)$ converges P-almost surely to θ^*, it is sufficient to show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$P\left(\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\hat{\theta}_n \in B_\varepsilon^c\right\}\right) = 0, \tag{37}$$

where $B_\varepsilon^c = \mathcal{K} \setminus (B_\varepsilon \cap \mathcal{K})$.

Since $\mathcal{K}$ is compact, there exists a finite sequence $(\theta_i)_{1\le i\le N}$ in $\mathcal{K}$ and $\{r_i\}_{1\le i\le N}$ in $\mathbb{R}_+$, where $r_i = r(\theta_i)$ comes from *v)*, such that the union of balls $B(\theta_i, r_i)$ covers $\mathcal{K}$. Note that if (35) holds for some r, then it holds for any $r' \le r$. So without loss of generality we can assume $r_i \le \varepsilon$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Let $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon$ be the subset of indexes $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that the ball $B(\theta_i, r_i)$ intersects the set B_ε^c. We denote by $\mathcal{N}_i$ the subset $\mathcal{N}(\theta_i)$ in assumption *v)* and by $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ the union of $\mathcal{N}_i$ for $i \in I_\varepsilon$. By definition and since for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, $r_i \le \varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{N}_i \subset B(\theta_i, g_0(\varepsilon))$, we have

$$B_\varepsilon^c \subset \bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} B(\theta_i, r_i), \quad \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{K} \oplus \bar{B}(0, g_0(\varepsilon)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon \cap A_\varepsilon = \emptyset. \tag{38}$$

The two latest properties imply that

$$\forall \theta \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon, \quad h^\theta > h^{\theta^*} + 2\varepsilon. \tag{39}$$

Let us finally consider the following sequence of random variables:

$$\delta_n^\varepsilon = \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon}\left(\min_{\theta'\in\mathcal{N}_i} h_n^{\theta'} - \inf_{\theta'\in B(\theta_i,r_i)\cap\mathcal{K}} h_n^{\theta'}\right).$$

Note that from (35) and since $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon$ is finite

$$P\left(\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\delta_n^\varepsilon \ge \varepsilon\right\}\right) = 0. \tag{40}$$

To prove (37), we consider the following inclusions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\hat{\theta}_n \in B_\varepsilon^c\right\} &\subset \limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\inf_{\theta\in B_\varepsilon^c} h_n^\theta \le h_n^{\theta^*}\right\}\\
&\subset \limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\min_{\theta\in\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} h_n^\theta - h_n^{\theta^*} \le \delta_n^\varepsilon\right\}\\
&\subset \limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\delta_n^\varepsilon \ge \varepsilon\right\}\bigcup\left\{\min_{\theta\in\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} h_n^\theta - h_n^{\theta^*} < \varepsilon\right\}\\
&= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\delta_n^\varepsilon \ge \varepsilon\right\}\bigcup\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\min_{\theta\in\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} h_n^\theta - h_n^{\theta^*} < \varepsilon\right\}\\
&= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\delta_n^\varepsilon \ge \varepsilon\right\}\bigcup\left\{\liminf_{n\to\infty}\left(\min_{\theta\in\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} h_n^\theta - h_n^{\theta^*}\right) \le \varepsilon\right\}\\
&\subset \limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\delta_n^\varepsilon \ge \varepsilon\right\}\bigcup\left\{\min_{\theta\in\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} h^\theta - h^{\theta^*} \le \varepsilon\right\}\bigcup\Omega_\varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where Ω_ε is the event where h_n^θ does not converge to h^θ, when n goes to infinity, for some θ in $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon \cup \{\theta^*\}$. Since $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon \cup \{\theta^*\}$ is countable and by assumption *i)*, $P(\Omega_\varepsilon) = 0$. Moreover, from (39), the set $\left\{\min_{\theta\in\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} h^\theta - h^{\theta^*} \le \varepsilon\right\}$ is empty. Recalling (40), we thereby deduce (37) and the lemma is proved. ■

Let us show that the assumptions *i)*, *ii)*, *iii)*, *iv)* and *v)* of Lemma 4 hold for the family of contrast functions

$$h_n^\theta(\omega_{\Lambda_n}^*) = K_n^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}^*) = \frac{\ln(Z_{\Lambda_n}^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta})}{|\Lambda_n|} + \frac{H_{\Lambda_n}^\theta(\omega_{\Lambda_n}^*)}{|\Lambda_n|}.$$

To prove *i)*, first note, from [**MeanEnergy**], [**Boundary**] and the ergodic theorem, that for any $\theta \in \Theta$ and P-almost all ω

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) = E_P(H^{\theta}_0) = H^{\theta}(P).$$

Second, recall from assumption [**VarPrin**] that for any $\delta \in I$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, $\ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})/|\Lambda_n|$ converges to $p(\delta,\theta)$ and $\delta \mapsto p(\delta,\theta)$ is right continuous. On the other hand, from Lemma 3, $\hat{\delta}_n \to \delta^*$ almost surely with $\hat{\delta}_n > \delta^*$. Let $\theta \in \Theta$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta^+ > \delta^*$ such that $|p(\delta^*,\theta) - p(\delta^+,\theta)| < \epsilon$. Let n be sufficiently large so that $\hat{\delta}_n < \delta^+$, $|\ln(Z^{\delta^+,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})/|\Lambda_n| - p(\delta^+,\theta)| < \epsilon$ and $|\ln(Z^{\delta^*,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})/|\Lambda_n| - p(\delta^*,\theta)| < \epsilon$. Then, since $\delta \mapsto Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}$ is decreasing, we have

$$\ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})/|\Lambda_n| - p(\delta^*,\theta) \le \ln(Z^{\delta^*,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})/|\Lambda_n| - p(\delta^*,\theta) < \epsilon$$

and

$$p(\delta^*,\theta) - \ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})/|\Lambda_n| \le p(\delta^*,\theta) - p(\delta^+,\theta) + p(\delta^+,\theta) - \ln(Z^{\delta^+,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})/|\Lambda_n| < 2\epsilon,$$

proving that $\ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n})/|\Lambda_n|$ converges to $p(\delta^*,\theta)$ almost surely.

Hence for any $\theta \in \Theta$ and for P-almost every ω^*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} h^{\theta}_n(\omega^*_{\Lambda_n}) = h^{\theta}$$

where

$$h^{\theta} = p(\delta^*,\theta) + H^{\theta}(P)$$

which proves assumption *i)*.

To prove Assumption *ii)*, note from [**VarPrin**] that for any $\theta \in \Theta$, any $P^{\delta^*,\theta} \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta^*,\theta}$ and any $P^{\delta^*,\theta^*} \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta^*,\theta^*}$

$$p(\delta^*,\theta) \ge -\mathcal{I}(P^{\delta^*,\theta^*}) - H^{\theta}(P^{\delta^*,\theta^*})$$

while $-\mathcal{I}(P^{\delta^*,\theta^*}) = p(\delta^*,\theta^*) + H^{\theta}(P^{\delta^*,\theta^*})$ so that

$$h^{\theta} \ge h^{\theta^*}.$$

From [**VarPrin**], the equality holds if and only if $\theta = \theta^*$ which proves Assumption *ii)*.

Assumption *iii)* is given by Lemma 2.

The function $\theta \mapsto H^{\theta}(P)$ is continuous thanks to (16) in assumption [**Regularity**]. By assumption [**VarPrin**] we have for any θ and θ' in Θ

$$p(\delta^*,\theta') \ge p(\delta^*,\theta) + H^{\theta}(P^{\delta^*,\theta}) - H^{\theta'}(P^{\delta^*,\theta}),$$

where $P^{\delta^*,\theta} \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta^*,\theta}$. By continuity of $\theta \mapsto H^{\theta}(P)$, it follows that $\theta \mapsto p(\delta^*,\theta)$ is lower semicontinuous. Therefore $\theta \mapsto h^{\theta}$ is lower semicontinuous and assumption *iv)* holds.

It remains to prove assumption *v)*. Let us start with some preliminary results.

Thanks to [**MeanEnergy**], [**Boundary**], (16) in [**Regularity**] and the ergodic Theorem, we have that, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, any $r > 0$ and P-almost every ω,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sup_{\substack{\theta' \in \mathcal{K} \\ |\theta-\theta'|<r}} \left| H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) - H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \right| \le g(r). \tag{41}$$

This inequality allows us to control the variation of the infimum of the specific energy in the contrast functions. The following lemma deals with the variation of the finite volume pressure.

Lemma 5 *For any $\eta > 0$ and any $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{K}$, there exists a finite subset $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0) \subset B(\theta_0, \eta) \cap \Theta$ and $0 < r(\theta_0) < \eta$ such that for $n \geq 1$ and any $\delta \in I$*

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}(\theta_0)} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) - \inf_{\theta \in B(\theta_0, r(\theta_0)) \cap \mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) \leq e^{\kappa+1} g(r(\theta_0)), \tag{42}$$

where g comes from assumption [**Regularity**] *and κ from assumption* [**Stability**].

Proof. For any $\delta \in I$ and any θ, θ' in Θ

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln(Z^{\delta,\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}) - \ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) &= \ln\left(\int \frac{1}{Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}} e^{-H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^{\delta}_{\infty}}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \pi_{\Lambda_n}(d\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \\
&= \ln\left(\int e^{-H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) + H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^{\delta}_{\infty}}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(d\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \\
&= \ln E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(e^{-H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n} + H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}})
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where $P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}$ is the probability measure $(1/Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) e^{-H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^{\delta}_{\infty}} \pi_{\Lambda_n}$. By Jensen's inequality we have that

$$\ln(Z^{\delta,\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}) - \ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) \geq E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n} - H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}).$$

For any $\eta > 0$ and θ_0 in $\mathcal{K}$ we choose $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0)$ and $r(\theta_0) > 0$ as in (17). Denoting $[x]_+ = \max(x, 0)$ and writing for short $\mathcal{N}$ for $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0)$ and B for $B(\theta_0, r(\theta_0)) \cap \mathcal{K}$, we obtain, for any $\delta \geq \delta_{\min}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) - \inf_{\theta \in B} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) \\
&\qquad = \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\theta' \in B} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \left(\ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) - \ln(Z^{\delta,\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \\
&\qquad \leq \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\theta' \in B} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \left(E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n} - H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\theta' \in B} E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}} \left(\frac{H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n} - H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}{N_{\Lambda_n}} N_{\Lambda_n} \right) \\
&\qquad \leq \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\theta' \in B} \sup_{\omega_{\Lambda_n} \in \Omega^{\delta}_{\infty}} \left[\frac{H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) - H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})}{N_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \right]_+ E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n}) \\
&\qquad \leq \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \left(\max_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \left[\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \sup_{\theta' \in B} \sup_{\omega_{\Lambda_n} \in \Omega^{\delta}_{\infty}} \left(\frac{H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) - H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})}{N_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \right) \right]_+ \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \left(\max_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \left[- \max_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \inf_{\theta' \in B} \inf_{\omega_{\Lambda_n} \in \Omega^{\delta}_{\infty}} \left(\frac{H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) - H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})}{N_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \right) \right]_+ \\
&\qquad \leq \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \left(\max_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n}) \right) g(r(\theta_0)).
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Let us control $E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n})$ by entropy inequalities. By definition of the entropy, the assumption [**Stability**] and the standard inequality $Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n} \geq \pi_{\Lambda_n}(\{\emptyset\}) = e^{-|\Lambda_n|}$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{\Lambda_n}(P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) &= \int \ln\left(\frac{e^{-H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n}} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^{\delta}_{\infty}}(\omega_{\Lambda_n})}{Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}} \right) P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n} \\
&\leq -\ln(Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) - \int H^{\theta}_{\Lambda_n} P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n} \\
&\leq |\Lambda_n| + \kappa E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n}).
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

The entropy is also characterised by

$$\mathcal{I}_{\Lambda_n}(P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) = \sup_g \left(\int g P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n} - \ln\left(\int e^g \pi_{\Lambda_n} \right) \right)$$

where the supremum is over all bounded measurable functions g, see for example [28]. Choosing $g = (\kappa+1) N_{\Lambda_n} \mathbb{1}_{N_{\Lambda_n} \leq C}$ for any constant $C > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\Lambda_n}(P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) &\geq (\kappa+1) E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n} \mathbb{1}_{N_{\Lambda_n} \leq C}) - \ln\left(\int e^{(\kappa+1) N_{\Lambda_n} \mathbb{1}_{N_{\Lambda_n} \leq C}} \pi_{\Lambda_n} \right) \\ &\geq (\kappa+1) E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n} \mathbb{1}_{N_{\Lambda_n} \leq C}) - (e^{\kappa+1} - 1)|\Lambda_n|. \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Let C goes to infinity and combine (45) and (46), we obtain that for any (δ, θ)

$$E_{P^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}}(N_{\Lambda_n}) \leq e^{\kappa+1} |\Lambda_n|. \tag{47}$$

The inequalities (44) and (47) imply (42). ■

We are now in position to prove *v)*. The function g_0 in *v)* depends on g in (41) and Lemma 5 as follows. For any $x > 0$, we choose $g_0(x) > 0$ such that

$$g(2\, g_0(x)) + e^{\kappa+1} g(g_0(x)) < x.$$

This choice is always possible since $g(u)$ tends to 0 when u goes to 0.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{K}$ and consider the finite subset $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0) \subset B(\theta_0, \eta) \cap \Theta$ and the positive number $r(\theta_0)$, with $r(\theta_0) < \eta$, given by Lemma 5 where $\eta = g_0(\varepsilon)$. In the following, we write for short $\mathcal{N}$ for $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0)$ and B for $B(\theta_0, r(\theta_0)) \cap \mathcal{K}$. Using (41), Lemma 5 and the definition of g_0, we have that for P-almost every ω,

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{n\to\infty} \left(\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} h^\theta_n(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) - \inf_{\theta \in B} h^\theta_n(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \\ &= \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \left(\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \left(H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) + \ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) \right) - \inf_{\theta \in B} \left(H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) + \ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \left(\max_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) - \inf_{\theta \in B} H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) + \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) - \inf_{\theta \in B} \ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \\ &\leq \max_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sup_{\theta' \in B} \left| H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) - H^{\theta'}_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \right| + \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \left(\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} \ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) - \inf_{\theta \in B} \ln(Z^{\hat{\delta}_n,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}) \right) \\ &\leq g(2\, g_0(\varepsilon)) + e^{\kappa+1} g(g_0(\varepsilon)) < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which proves *v)*.

5.2 Proof of Corollary 1

To apply Theorem 1, we have to prove that [**Argmax**] and [**Regularity**] hold true in the setting of exponential models. Assumptions [**Argmax**] and the inequality (16) in [**Regularity**] are obviously satisfied since the energy H^θ_Λ and the mean energy H^θ_0 are linear in θ.

It remains to check (17) in [**Regularity**]. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a compact subset of Θ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathcal{K} \oplus B(0, \epsilon) \subset \Theta$. For any $\eta > 0$ and $\theta_0 \in \mathcal{K}$, we choose r sufficiently small such that $\theta := (1 + r/\epsilon)\theta_0 \in B(\theta_0, \eta) \cap \Theta$ and we set $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0) = \{\theta\}$. Note that for any $\theta' \in \mathcal{B}(\theta_0, r)$, $\frac{\epsilon}{r}(\theta - \theta') \in B(\theta_0, \epsilon) \subset \mathcal{K} \oplus B(0, \epsilon)$. Then from (21) and the assumption [**Stability**], for any $\theta' \in B(\theta_0, r)$, for any $\omega_\Lambda \in \Omega^{\delta_{\min}}_\infty$,

$$\frac{\epsilon}{r}(H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda) - H^{\theta'}_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)) = H^{\epsilon(\theta-\theta')/r}_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda) \geq -\kappa N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)$$

which implies $(H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda) - H^{\theta'}_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)) \geq -r\frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)$ and thus (17).

5.3 Proof of Theorem 2

We check the assumptions of the more general Theorem 1 with the choice $\Theta = \mathcal{Z} \times \Upsilon$ where $\mathcal{Z}$ and Υ are bounded open subsets of $(0, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{R}$ respectively satisfying $\mathcal{Z} \times \Upsilon \supset \mathcal{K}$. We denote in the following $\theta = (z, \beta, R)$, where $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $(\beta, R) \in \Upsilon$.

For any $\delta \in I$ and $(\beta, R) \in \Upsilon$, the pairwise interaction $\infty \mathbb{1}_{[0,\delta)} + \phi^{\beta,R}$ is superstable, finite range and bounded from above. The existence of Gibbs measures in this setting, i.e. assumption [**Existence**], is proved for example in [26]. Moreover, we can deduce the following useful result from Corollary 2.9 in [26]: for any $P \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$, for any bounded set Δ and any $c > 0$,

$$E_P\left(e^{cN_\Delta}\right) < \infty. \tag{48}$$

Superstability implies [**Stability**], where the lower bound can be chosen uniformly over Θ since this set is bounded and using the hardcore property. The decomposition in [**MeanEnergy**] can be done by

$$H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_n} H^\theta_0 \circ \tau_{-k}(\omega) + \partial H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega) \tag{49}$$

where

$$H^\theta_0(\omega) = z\, N_{\Delta_0}(\omega) + \sum_{\{x,y\} \in \omega_{\Delta_0}} \phi^{\beta,R}(x-y) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \omega_{\Delta_0}, y \in \omega_{\Delta_0^c}} \phi^{\beta,R}(x-y) \tag{50}$$

and

$$\partial H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \omega_{\Lambda_n}, y \in \omega_{\Lambda_n^c}} \phi^{\beta,R}(x-y).$$

The finiteness of the mean energy given by (15) is easily deduced from the finite range and boundedness of $\phi^{\beta,R}$ along with (48) that implies finite second order moments for P. On the other hand from (2) we have

$$H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega) - H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) = \sum_{x \in \omega_{\Lambda_n}, y \in \omega_{\Lambda_n^c}} \phi^{\beta,R}(x-y).$$

Therefore [**MeanEnergy**] and [**Boundary**] reduce to prove that for P-almost every $\omega \in \Omega_T$

$$\sup_{(\beta,R) \in \Upsilon} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \omega_{\Lambda_n}, y \in \omega_{\Lambda_n^c}} \phi^{\beta,R}(x-y) \to 0. \tag{51}$$

Recall the definition of $I_n = \{-n, \dots, n-1\}^d$. Since $\phi^{\beta,R}$ has finite range and is continuous, there exist two constant c and $\bar{r}$ large enough such that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{(\beta,R) \in \Upsilon} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x \in \omega_{\Lambda_n}, y \in \omega_{\Lambda_n^c}} |\phi^{\beta,R}(x-y)| &\leq \frac{c}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{i \in I_n \setminus I_{n-1}} N_{B(i,\bar{r}) \cap \Lambda_n}(\omega) N_{B(i,\bar{r}) \cap \Lambda_n^c}(\omega) \\ &\leq \frac{c}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{i \in I_n \setminus I_{n-1}} N^2_{B(i,\bar{r})}(\omega).\end{aligned}$$

From (48), for any $P \in \mathcal{G}^{\delta,\theta}$, $E_P(N^2_{B(i,\bar{r})})$ is finite and by stationarity $E_P(N^2_{B(i,\bar{r})}) = E_P(N^2_{B(0,\bar{r})})$. The ergodic theorem thus implies that P almost surely

$$\frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{i \in I_n} N^2_{B(i,\bar{r})}(\omega) \to E_P(N^2_{B(0,\bar{r})})$$

which yields (51).

Assumption [**Argmax**] holds because $(\beta, R) \mapsto \phi^{\beta,R}(x)$ is lower semicontinuous by construction and the number of discontinuities are finite, so it is easy to change the sense of the brackets in (23) to obtain an upper semicontinuous version.

It remains to check (a) [**Regularity**] and (b) [**VarPrin**].

(a) We start to prove (16) in [**Regularity**]. Note from (50) that

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^\theta(\omega) - H_0^{\theta'}(\omega) &= (z - z')\, N_{\Delta_0}(\omega) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} (\phi^{\beta,R} - \phi^{\beta',R'})(x-y) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0}, y\in\omega_{\Delta_0^c}} (\phi^{\beta,R} - \phi^{\beta',R'})(x-y). \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

If $|\theta - \theta'| < r$, obviously there exists a positive function g with $\lim_{s\to 0} g(s) = 0$ such that

$$|z - z'|\, N_{\Delta_0}(\omega) \le g(r) N_{\Delta_0}(\omega). \tag{53}$$

The two sums in the right hand side of (52) can be handled similarly. We give the details for the first one only, which reduces from (23) to consider the following generic term for P-almost every ω

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} |\mathbb{1}_{(R_{k-1},R_k)}(|x-y|)\, \varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x-y|) - \mathbb{1}_{(R'_{k-1},R'_k)}(|x-y|)\, \varphi_k^{\beta',R'}(|x-y|)| \\ &\le \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} |\varphi_k^{\beta,R} - \varphi_k^{\beta',R'}|(|x-y|) + c \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} |\mathbb{1}_{(R_{k-1},R_k)} - \mathbb{1}_{(R'_{k-1},R'_k)}|(|x-y|) \end{aligned}$$

where c is a positive constant that comes from the boundedness of $\varphi_k^{\beta,R}$. Since the map $(\beta, R, x) \mapsto \varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x|)$ is continuous it is uniformly continuous on any compact set and there exists a positive function g, independent of x, y and θ, such that $\lim_{s\to 0} g(s) = 0$, and if $|\theta - \theta'| < r$ then

$$\sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} |\varphi_k^{\beta,R} - \varphi_k^{\beta',R'}|(|x-y|) \le \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} g(r) \le g(r) N^2_{\Delta_0}(\omega). \tag{54}$$

On the other hand, denoting ΔR_k the symmetric difference $(R_{k-1}, R_k)\Delta(R'_{k-1}, R'_k)$, we have for any $R \in \mathcal{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} E_P\left(\sup_{\substack{R'\in\mathcal{R} \\ |R-R'|\le r}} \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta R_k}(|x-y|) \right) &= E_P\left(\sum_{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} \sup_{\substack{R'\in\mathcal{R} \\ |R-R'|\le r}} \sum_{y\in\omega_{\Delta_0}, y\neq x} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta R_k}(|x-y|) \right) \\ &= E_P\left(\int_{\Delta_0} e^{-h^\theta(x|\omega)} \sup_{\substack{R'\in\mathcal{R} \\ |R-R'|\le r}} \sum_{y\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta R_k}(|x-y|)\, dx \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from the Georgii-Nguyen-Zessin (GNZ) formula [7, 21] and $h^\theta(x|\omega)$ denotes the local energy needed to insert the point x into the configuration ω, defined for any

$\Lambda \ni x$ by $h^\theta(x|\omega) = H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega \cup x) - H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega)$. Applying again the GNZ formula we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_P\left(\sup_{\substack{R'\in\mathcal{R}\\|R-R'|\leq r}} \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta R_k}(|x-y|)\right)\\
&= E_P\left(\int_{\Delta_0^2} e^{-h^\theta(y|\omega)} e^{-h^\theta(x|\omega\cup\{y\})} \sup_{\substack{R'\in\mathcal{R}\\|R-R'|\leq r}} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta R_k}(|x-y|)dxdy\right)\\
&\leq E_P\left(e^{cN_{\Delta_0\oplus B(0,\bar{r})}}\right)\int_{\Delta_0^2} \sup_{\substack{R'\in\mathcal{R}\\|R-R'|\leq r}} \mathbb{1}_{\Delta R_k}(|x-y|)dxdy\\
&\leq E_P\left(e^{cN_{\Delta_0\oplus B(0,\bar{r})}}\right)|\Delta_0||\mathcal{A}_k(r)| \qquad (55)
\end{aligned}$$

where c and $\bar{r}$ are two constants large enough and $\mathcal{A}_k(r)$ is the union of the two rings $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ R_{k-1} - r \leq |y| \leq R_{k-1} + r\}$ and $\{y,\ R_k - r \leq |y| \leq R_k + r\}$. Thanks to (48) and since $|\mathcal{A}_k(r)| \to 0$ as $r \to 0$, the upper bound in (55) tends to 0 as $r \to 0$. The same conclusion holds true in (53) and (54) because $E_P(N_{\Delta_0}) < \infty$ and $E_P(N^2_{\Delta_0}) < \infty$. The combination of these results shows (16).

Let us now prove (17) in **[Regularity]**. Let $\eta > 0$ and $\theta_0 = (z_0, \beta_0, R_0) \in \mathcal{K}$ where $R_0 = (R_{0,1}, \dots, R_{0,q})$. We choose r sufficiently small to ensure that

(i) $r < \eta$,

(ii) $B(\theta_0, r) \subset \Theta$,

(iii) $2r < \inf_{k=1,\dots,q} |R_{0,k} - R_{0,k-1}|$,

(iv) for all $k = 1, \dots, q$, if $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) \neq \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$, then for all $\theta', \theta'' \in B(\theta_0, r)$ and for all x such that $||x| - R_{0,k}| < r$, we have

$$\left(\varphi_k^{\beta',R'}(|x|) - \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta'',R''}(|x|)\right)\left(\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) - \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})\right) > 0,$$

which is possible by continuity of $(\beta, R, x) \mapsto \varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x|)$.

Then we fix $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0) = \{(z_0, \beta_0, R)\}$ where $R = (R_1, \dots, R_q)$ is defined as follows : if $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) > \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$ then $R_k = R_{0,k} + r$, if $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) < \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$ then $R_k = R_{0,k} - r$, and if $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) = \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$ then $R_k = R_{0,k}$.

For $\theta = (z_0, \beta_0, R)$ and $\theta' \in B(\theta_0, r)$, the proof of (17) amounts to control

$$\frac{H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda) - H^{\theta'}_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)}{N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)} = (z_0 - z') + \frac{1}{N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)} \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega, \{x,y\}\cap\omega_\Lambda\neq\emptyset} \left(\phi^{\beta_0,R}(x-y) - \phi^{\beta',R'}(x-y)\right). \quad (56)$$

The first term $(z_0 - z')$ is greater than $-g(r)$ for a positive function g with $\lim_{s\to 0} g(s) = 0$. For the second term, let us introduce the middle points $\bar{R}_{0,k} = \frac{1}{2}(R_{0,k-1} + R_{0,k})$ for $k = 1, \dots, q-1$, $\bar{R}_{0,0} = 0$ and $\bar{R}_{0,q} = R_{0,q} + 2r$. Note that from our choice of r, for any k both R_k and R'_k belong to $[\bar{R}_{0,k}, \bar{R}_{0,k+1}]$. From (23), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi^{\beta_0,R}(x) - \phi^{\beta',R'}(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^q \mathbb{1}_{[\bar{R}_{0,k},\bar{R}_{0,k+1}]}(|x|)(\phi^{\beta_0,R}(x) - \phi^{\beta',R'}(x))\\
&= \sum_{k=0}^q \Big(\mathbb{1}_{[\bar{R}_{0,k},R_k)}(|x|)\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R}(|x|) + \mathbb{1}_{[R_k,\bar{R}_{0,k+1}]}(|x|)\varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R}(|x|)\\
&\quad - \mathbb{1}_{[\bar{R}_{0,k},R'_k)}(|x|)\varphi_k^{\beta',R'}(|x|) - \mathbb{1}_{[R'_k,\bar{R}_{0,k+1}]}(|x|)\varphi_{k+1}^{\beta',R'}(|x|)\Big). \qquad (57)
\end{aligned}$$

If $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) > \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$, then $R_k > R'_k$ and the k-th term in the sum above writes

$$\mathbb{1}_{[\bar{R}_{0,k},R'_k)}(|x|)\left(\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R}(|x|) - \varphi_k^{\beta',R'}(|x|)\right) + \mathbb{1}_{[R'_k,R_k]}(|x|)\left(\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R}(|x|) - \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta',R'}(|x|)\right) \\ + \mathbb{1}_{[R_k,\bar{R}_{0,k+1}]}(|x|)\left(\varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R}(|x|) - \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta',R'}(|x|)\right).$$

From our choice of r, see (iv), the second term is always positive, and by uniform continuity of $(\beta, R, x) \mapsto \varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x|)$, there exists a positive function g, independent of x, with $\lim_{s\to 0} g(s) = 0$, such that the two remaining terms are greater than $-g(r)\mathbb{1}_{[0,\bar{R}_{0,q}]}(|x|)$. We thus obtain that the k-th term in (57) is greater than $-g(r)\mathbb{1}_{[0,\bar{R}_{0,q}]}(|x|)$.

If $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) < \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$, we obtain the same lower bound by using the fact that $R_k < R'_k$. If $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) = \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$, then by uniform continuity $\left|\varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x|) - \varphi_{k'}^{\beta',R'}(|y|)\right| < g(r)$ for any $k' = k, k+1$, any $|x|, |y|$ in $[\bar{R}_{0,k}, \bar{R}_{0,k+1}]$ and any θ, θ' in $B(\theta_0, r)$, and the same lower bound holds for the the k-th term in (57).

Coming back to (56), we deduce that

$$\frac{H_\Lambda^\theta(\omega_\Lambda) - H_\Lambda^{\theta'}(\omega_\Lambda)}{N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)} > -g(r) - (q+1)g(r)\frac{1}{N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)} \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega, \{x,y\}\cap\omega_\Lambda\neq\emptyset} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\bar{R}_{0,q}]}(|x-y|).$$

For any $\omega \in \Omega_\infty^{\delta_{\min}}$, there exists $c > 0$ such that for any $x \in \omega$, $\sum_{y\in\omega, y\neq x} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\bar{R}_{0,q}]}(|x-y|) \leq c$ because of the hardcore distance $\delta_{\min} > 0$. Consequently the lower bound above is greater than $-g(r)$, up to a positive constant, and this completes the proof.

(b) The variational principle in this setting is proved in [9], which implies (20) with equality if and only if $P^{\delta',\theta'} = P^{\delta,\theta}$. When $(\delta', \theta') = (\delta^*, \theta^*)$, $P^{\delta^*,\theta^*} = P^{\delta,\theta}$ is equivalent to $(\delta, \theta) = (\delta^*, \theta^*)$ from our identifiability assumption (25). Hence, in order to verify **[VarPrin]**, it remains to prove that the pressure (19) is right continuous in δ.

For any $\delta > 0$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, from the rescaling $\omega \to \delta\omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta} &= \int e^{-H_{\Lambda_n}^\theta(\omega_{\Lambda_n})} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty^\delta}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \pi_{\Lambda_n}(d\omega) \\ &= e^{-|\Lambda_n|(1-1/\delta^d)} \int e^{-H_{\Lambda_n}^\theta((\delta\omega)_{\Lambda_n})} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty^1}(\omega_{\Lambda_n}) \delta^{N_{\frac{1}{\delta}\Lambda_n}(\omega)} \pi_{\frac{1}{\delta}\Lambda_n}(d\omega) \\ &= e^{-|\Lambda_n|(1-1/\delta^d)} \tilde{Z}_{\frac{1}{\delta}\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{Z}_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta} = \int e^{-\tilde{H}_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}(\omega_\Lambda)} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega_\infty^1}(\omega_\Lambda) \pi_\Lambda(d\omega_\Lambda)$ is the partition function associated to the Gibbs measure defined on Ω_∞^1 with energy function $\tilde{H}_\Lambda^{\delta,\theta}(\omega_\Lambda) = H_{\delta\Lambda}^\theta(\delta(\omega_\Lambda)) - N_\Lambda(\omega)\ln(\delta)$. Denoting $\tilde{p}(\delta, \theta)$ the pressure associated to the latter measure, we deduce

$$p(\delta, \theta) = \frac{1}{\delta^d}\,\tilde{p}(\delta, \theta) - 1 + 1/\delta^d. \tag{58}$$

The energy function $\tilde{H}_{\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta}$ follows a decomposition like (14) where

$$\tilde{H}_0^{\delta,\theta}(\omega) = (z - \ln(\delta))\, N_{\Delta_0}(\omega) + \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\delta\Delta_0}} \phi^{\beta,R}(\delta x - \delta y) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x\in\omega_{\delta\Delta_0}, y\in\omega_{\delta\Delta_0^c}} \phi^{\beta,R}(\delta x - \delta y).$$

By similar arguments as used earlier in (a) to prove (16), we deduce that $\delta \mapsto E_P(\tilde{H}_0^{\delta,\theta})$ is continuous. Moreover, $\tilde{H}_{\Lambda_n}^{\delta,\theta}$ inherits the superstable, lower regular and regular properties of $\phi^{\beta,R}$, which shows from [9] that a variational principle holds, i.e. for any (δ, θ) and (δ', θ')

$$\tilde{p}(\delta', \theta') \geq \tilde{p}(\delta, \theta) + \tilde{H}^{\delta,\theta}(\tilde{P}^{\delta,\theta}) - \tilde{H}^{\delta',\theta'}(\tilde{P}^{\delta,\theta}),$$

where $\tilde{P}^{\delta,\theta}$ denotes a Gibbs measure associated to $\tilde{H}^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}$. Note that contrary to (20), this inequality is valid for any δ, δ' because $\tilde{P}^{\delta,\theta}$ is supported on Ω^1_∞ for any (δ, θ). We therefore deduce that $\delta \mapsto \tilde{p}(\delta, \theta)$ is lower semicontinuous, and so is $\delta \mapsto p(\delta, \theta)$ from (58). Since $\delta \mapsto Z^{\delta,\theta}_{\Lambda_n}$ is decreasing, $\delta \mapsto p(\delta, \theta)$ turns out to be both decreasing and lower semicontinuous, which shows that it is right continuous.

5.4 Proof of Theorem 3

As in the previous section, it is sufficient to check the assumption of the main Theorem 1. The assumption [**Stability**] is included in the assumptions of Theorem 3 and has not to be showed. The proofs of assumptions [**Existence**], [**MeanEnergy**], [**Boundary**], [**Argmax**] and the first part of [**Regularity**], i.e. (16), are the same as in the proof of Theorem 2. The variational principle is shown in [4] for any finite range stable pair potential. Since $I = \{0\}$, the right continuity of the pressure is not required here, so Assumption [**VarPrin**] follows. It remains to prove the second part of [**Regularity**], i.e. (17).

Let $\eta > 0$ and $\theta_0 = (z_0, \beta_0, R_0) \in \mathcal{K}$ where $R_0 = (R_{0,1}, \dots, R_{0,q})$. We denote by $\bar{R}$ the maximal value of R_q when $\theta = (z, \beta, R) \in \mathcal{K}$. We choose $r > 0$ small enough such that

(i) $r < \eta$,

(ii) $B(\theta_0, r) \subset \Theta$,

(iii) $2r < \inf_{k=1,\dots,q} |R_{0,k} - R_{0,k-1}|$,

(iv) there exists $\beta_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ such that for any $\theta' \in B(\theta_0, r)$, any $\theta = (z, \beta, R) \in B((z_0, \beta_1, R_0), \sqrt{qr})$, any $k = 1, \dots, q$ and any $x \in B(0, \bar{R})$

$$\varphi_k^{(\beta,R)}(|x|) \geq \varphi_k^{(\beta',R')}(|x|),$$

which is possible by continuity of $(\beta, R, x) \mapsto \varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x|)$ and thanks to the local positivity assumption (26).

(v) for all $k = 1, \dots, q$, if $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) \neq \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$, then for all $\theta', \theta'' \in B(\theta_0, r) \cup B((z_0, \beta_1, R_0), \sqrt{qr})$ and for all x such that $||x| - R_{0,k}| < r$, we have

$$\left(\varphi_k^{\beta',R'}(|x|) - \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta'',R''}(|x|)\right)\left(\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) - \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})\right) > 0,$$

which is possible by continuity of $(\beta, R, x) \mapsto \varphi_k^{\beta,R}(|x|)$ and since β_1 can be chosen as close as we want to β_0.

(vi) for all $k = 1, \dots, q$, if $\varphi_k^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k}) = \varphi_{k+1}^{\beta_0,R_0}(R_{0,k})$, then for all $\theta' \in B(\theta_0, r)$, $\theta \in B((z_0, \beta_1, R_0), \sqrt{qr})$ and for all x such that $||x| - R_{0,k}| < r$,

$$\varphi_k^{(\beta,R)}(|x|) \geq \varphi_{k+1}^{(\beta',R')}(|x|) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{k+1}^{(\beta,R)}(|x|) \geq \varphi_k^{(\beta',R')}(|x|),$$

which is possible for the same reasons as in (iv).

Now we choose $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0) = \{(z_0, \beta_1, R)\}$ where $R = (R_1, R_2, \dots, R_q)$ is as in the proof of Theorem 2, see (56) and before. Note that (z_0, β_1, R) is in $B((z_0, \beta_1, R_0), \sqrt{qr})$ and that β_1 can be chosen sufficiently close to β_0 to ensure $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0) \subset B(\theta_0, \eta)$. Following the same calculus as in (57), we obtain that for any $\theta' = (z', \beta', R') \in B(\theta_0, r)$

$$\phi^{\beta_1,R}(x) \geq \phi^{\beta',R'}(x).$$

We deduce that

$$\frac{H_\Lambda^{\theta_0}(\omega_\Lambda) - H_\Lambda^{\theta'}(\omega_\Lambda)}{N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)} > z_0 - z' > -r$$

and the second part of [**Regularity**] is proved.

5.5 Proof of Theorem 4

We check the assumptions of Theorem 1. For any $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ the pair potential ϕ^β is regular and non-integrably divergent at the origin. As it is well known (see [25] for instance), ϕ^β is superstable and the existence of an associated Gibbs measures follows, i.e. [**Existence**] holds true. Superstability implies stability which shows assumption [**Stability**]. Since the map $\beta \mapsto \phi^\beta$ is differentiable and so continuous, assumption [**Argmax**] is obvious. The decomposition in [**MeanEnergy**] is done as in (49). In particular the mean energy (15) is

$$H^\theta(P) = E_P\left(z\, N_{\Delta_0} + \sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_{\Delta_0}} \phi^\beta(x-y) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0}, y\in\omega_{\Delta_0^c}} \phi^\beta(x-y)\right) \tag{59}$$

where $\theta = (z, \beta)$. To check assumptions [**MeanEnergy**] and [**Boundary**], we thus have to prove that (59) is finite and that for any compact set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{B}$,

$$\sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x\in\omega_{\Lambda_n}, y\in\omega_{\Lambda_n^c}} \phi^\beta(x-y) \to 0. \tag{60}$$

For this purpose, we need the following Ruelle estimates.

Proposition 3 ([26]) *We define, for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\psi_i = \psi(max(|i|-1, 0)$, where the function ψ comes from assumption* (27). *Then $\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_i < +\infty$ and for any $c > 0$*

$$E_P\left(e^{c\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_i N_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}}\right) < +\infty.$$

Let us show (60). Note that

$$\sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{x\in\omega_{\Lambda_n}, y\in\omega_{\Lambda_n^c}} \phi^\beta(x-y) \le A_1 + A_2$$

with

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{x\in\omega_{\Lambda_n\setminus\Lambda_{n-n_0}} \\ y\in\omega,\, y\neq x \\ |x-y|\le r_0}} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}} |\phi^\beta|(x-y) \qquad \text{and} \qquad A_2 = \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{x\in\omega_{\Lambda_n} \\ y\in\omega_{\Lambda_n^c} \\ |x-y|>r_0}} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}} |\phi^\beta|(x-y),$$

where r_0 comes from assumption (27) and n_0 is an integer greater than r_0.

By the spatial ergodic theorem, P-almost surely

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|} \sum_{\substack{x\in\omega_{\Lambda_n} \\ y\in\omega,\, y\neq x \\ |x-y|\le r_0}} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}} |\phi^\beta|(x-y) = E\Bigg(\sum_{\substack{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0} \\ y\in\omega,\, y\neq x \\ |x-y|\le r_0}} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}} |\phi^\beta|(x-y)\Bigg).$$

Therefore, A_1 goes P-almost surely to 0 if the expectation above is finite. By the GNZ equation, stationarity of P and assumption (27)

$$\begin{aligned}
E\Bigg(\sum_{\substack{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0}\\ y\in\omega,\, y\neq x\\ |x-y|\le r_0}} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}} |\phi^\beta|(x-y)\Bigg) &= z^* E\Bigg(e^{-\sum_{z\in\omega}\phi^{\beta^*}(z)} \sum_{\substack{y\in\omega\\ |y|\le r_0}} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}}\phi^\beta(y)\Bigg)\\
&\le z^* E\Bigg(e^{\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\psi_i N_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}} \sum_{\substack{y\in\omega\\ |y|\le r_0}} e^{-\sum_{z\in\omega,|z|\le r_0}\phi^{\beta^*}(z)} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}}\phi^\beta(y)\Bigg)\\
&\le z^* E\Bigg(e^{\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\psi_i N_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}} \sum_{\substack{y\in\omega\\ |y|\le r_0}} e^{-\phi^{\beta^*}(y)} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}}\phi^\beta(y)\Bigg)\\
&\le z^* E\Bigg(e^{\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\psi_i N_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}} N_{B(0,r_0)}\Bigg) \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}}\ \sup_{y\in\mathcal{B}(0,r_0)}\ \sup_{\beta'\in\mathcal{K}} e^{-\phi^{\beta'}(y)}\phi^\beta(y)
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

which is finite by assumption (30) and Proposition 3.

Regarding the term A_2, for any integer K we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_2 &\le \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|}\sum_{i\in\Lambda_n, j\in\Lambda_n^c} \psi_{|i-j|} N_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}(\omega) N_{\tau_j(\Delta_0)}(\omega)\\
&\le \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|}\sum_{i\in\Lambda_n\setminus\Lambda_{n-K}, j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \psi_{|i-j|} N_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}(\omega) N_{\tau_j(\Delta_0)}(\omega) + \frac{1}{|\Lambda_n|}\sum_{\substack{i\in\Lambda_{n-K}, j\in\mathbb{Z}^d\\ |j-i|\ge K}} \psi_{|i-j|} N_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}(\omega) N_{\tau_j(\Delta_0)}(\omega).
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

By Proposition 3, $N_{\Delta_0}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\psi_j N_{\tau_j(\Delta_0)}$ is integrable which implies thanks to the ergodic theorem that, when n goes to infinity, the first term in (62) goes to zero and the second term goes to

$$E\Bigg(N_{\Delta_0}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d, |j|\ge K}\psi_j N_{\tau_j(\Delta_0)}\Bigg).$$

Choosing K large enough this last expectation can be made smaller than any positive value. Therefore the term A_2 tends P-almost surely to zero as well and (60) holds true.

By similar computations as above, using the Ruelle estimates in Proposition 3, we obtain that the mean energy (59) is finite. Assumptions [**MeanEnergy**] and [**Boundary**] are verified.

The existence and finiteness of the pressure in assumption [**VarPrin**] is proved in Theorem 0.2 of [26]. The variational principle for such Gibbs measures is proved in [8, 9] and thanks to the identifiability assumption(32) we get [**VarPrin**].

It remains to prove [**Regularity**]. Let us show (16). For any compact set $\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{K}\subset\Theta$ with $\mathcal{Z}\subset\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{K}\subset\mathcal{B}$, for any $r>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_P\Bigg(\sup_{\substack{\theta'\in\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{K}\\ |\theta-\theta'|\le r}}\Big|H_0^\theta - H_0^{\theta'}\Big|\Bigg) &\le rE_P(N_{\Delta_0}) + E_P\Bigg(\sum_{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0}}\sum_{y\in\omega\setminus\{x\}} \sup_{\substack{\beta'\in\mathcal{K}\\ |\beta-\beta'|\le r}} |\phi^\beta-\phi^{\beta'}|(x-y)\Bigg)\\
&\le rE_P(N_{\Delta_0}) + rE_P\Bigg(\sum_{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0}}\sum_{y\in\omega\setminus\{x\}} \sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}}|\nabla\phi^\beta|(x-y)\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of (16) is completed if we show that the two expectations above are finite. This is clear for the first one. We split the second one according to $|y|\le r_0$ or $|y|>r_0$ where r_0 comes from assumption (27). Thanks to similar computations as in (61) we get

$$E_P\left(\sum_{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0}}\sum_{\substack{y\in\omega\setminus\{x\}\\|y|\le r_0}}\sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}}|\nabla\phi^\beta|(x-y)\right)$$

$$\le z^* E\left(e^{\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\psi_i N_{\tau_i(\Delta_0)}}N_{B(0,r_0)}\right)\sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}}\sup_{y\in\mathcal{B}(0,r_0)}\sup_{\beta'\in\mathcal{K}}e^{-\phi^{\beta'}(y)}|\nabla\phi^\beta|(y)$$

which is finite by (30) and Proposition 3, while from (29)

$$E_P\left(\sum_{x\in\omega_{\Delta_0}}\sum_{\substack{y\in\omega\setminus\{x\}\\|y|>r_0}}\sup_{\beta\in\mathcal{K}}|\nabla\phi^\beta|(x-y)\right)\le E\left(N_{\Delta_0}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\psi_j N_{\tau_j(\Delta_0)}\right)$$

which is also finite. This proves (16) in [**Regularity**].

To prove (17), let $\eta>0$ and $\theta_0=(z_0,\beta_0)\in\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{K}$. There exists $0<\xi<\eta$ such that $B(\beta_0,\xi)\subset\mathcal{B}$. Consider the open set U associated to $\mathcal{K}\oplus B(0,\xi)$ through the assumption (31). Let us fix $u_0\in U$ and $\epsilon>0$ such that $B(u_0,\epsilon)$ is a ball included in U. We choose r sufficiently small to ensure that $r<\xi$ and $\beta:=\beta_0+\frac{r}{\epsilon}u_0$ belongs to $B(\beta_0,\eta)$. By assumption, for any $\beta'\in B(\beta_0,r)$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, there exists $t\in[0,1]$ such that

$$\phi^\beta(x)-\phi^{\beta'}(x)=\nabla\phi^{\beta'+t(\beta-\beta')}(x).(\beta-\beta').$$

Note that the above choices ensure that $\beta'+t(\beta-\beta')$ belongs to $B(\beta_0,\xi)\subset\mathcal{K}\oplus B(0,\xi)$ and that $\frac{\epsilon}{r}(\beta-\beta')$ belongs to $B(u_0,\epsilon)\subset U$. Hence by assumption (31), for any $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\frac{\epsilon}{r}(\phi^\beta(x)-\phi^{\beta'}(x))\ge\tilde{\phi}(x)$$

where $\tilde{\phi}$ is a stable pair potential. We finally choose $\mathcal{N}(\theta_0)=\{\theta\}:=\{(z_0,\beta)\}$. Therefore for any bounded set Λ, any $\theta'=(z',\beta')\in[z_0-r,z_0+r]\times B(\beta_0,r)$ and any configuration ω, denoting by $A>0$ the stability constant of $\tilde{\phi}$, we have

$$H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)-H^{\theta'}_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)\ge(z_0-z')N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)+\sum_{\{x,y\}\in\omega_\Lambda}\frac{r}{\epsilon}\,\tilde{\phi}(x-y)\ge-r\,(1+A/\epsilon)N_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)$$

which proves (17) and concludes the proof.

5.6 Proof of Proposition 1

We apply Theorem 1. The local energy $h^\theta(x|\omega)$ associated to the area-interaction process is, for any Λ containing x,

$$h^\theta(x|\omega)=H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega\cup x)-H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega)=z+\beta\lambda^d\left(B(x,R)\setminus\bigcup_{y\in\omega}B(y,R)\right). \tag{63}$$

Since $\mathcal{K}$ is compact, $\bar{z}=\sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{K}}z$, $\bar{R}=\sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{K}}R$ and $\bar{\beta}=\sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{K}}|\beta|$ are all finite and h^θ is uniformly bounded:

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{K}}\sup_{\omega\in\Omega}|h^\theta(x|\omega)|\le\bar{z}+\bar{\beta}(2\bar{R})^d.$$

This local stability property implies [**Stability**]. Since h^θ has also finite range $2\bar{R}$, an associated Gibbs measure exists and the variational principle holds with the existence of the pressure, see

[24] and [4]. This gives [**Existence**] and [**VarPrin**]. Since the application $\theta \mapsto H^\theta_\Lambda(\omega)$ is continuous, the assumption [**Argmax**] is obviously satisfied. As for [**MeanEnergy**] we suggest this decomposition (other one could have been considered)

$$H^\theta_{\Lambda_n} = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}_n} H^\theta_0 \circ \tau_{-k} + \partial H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}$$

with

$$H^\theta_0(\omega) = zN_{\Delta_0}(\omega) + \lambda^d \left(\Delta_0 \cap \bigcup_{x\in\omega} B(x,R) \right). \tag{64}$$

Clearly $E_P(H^\theta_0)$ is finite. Moreover for any $n \geq 1$

$$|\partial H^\theta_{\Lambda_n}| \leq \bar{\beta}\lambda^d \left((\Lambda_n \oplus B(0,\bar{R})) \setminus (\Lambda_n \ominus B(0,\bar{R})) \right) \leq 4d\bar{\beta}\bar{R}(2n+2\bar{R})^{d-1}$$

which implies [**MeanEnergy**]. Similar computations show that assumption [**Boundary**] holds as well. Finally, Assumption [**Regularity**] is a consequence of the following uniform continuity of H^θ_0 coming from a simple geometric analysis: for any $\theta = (z,R,\beta)$, $\theta' = (z',R',\beta')$ in Θ (we assume $R \leq R'$)

$$\begin{aligned}|H^\theta_0 - H^{\theta'}_0| &\leq |H^{(z,R,\beta)}_0 - H^{(z',R,\beta)}_0| + |H^{(z',R,\beta)}_0 - H^{(z',R',\beta)}_0| + |H^{(z',R',\beta)}_0 - H^{(z',R',\beta')}_0| \\ &\leq |z-z'|N_{\Delta_0} + 2d|\beta|(2R')^d|R-R'|N_{\Delta_0\oplus B(0,R')} + |\beta-\beta'|.\end{aligned}$$

5.7 Proof of Proposition 2

Since the Quermass-interaction model has an exponential form, it is sufficient to check the assumptions of Corollary 1. The existence of the model for any $z > 0$ and any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is proved in [3] while stability of the interaction follows from [15]. The assumptions [**MeanEnergy**] and [**Boundary**] can be proved as in Section 5.6, see (64), thanks to the additivity of the Minkowski functionals. The assumption [**VarPrin**] follows from [4] since the interaction is stable and finite range.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Shigeru Mase for supplying his unpublished manuscript [18]. They also thank Jean-François Coeurjolly for fruitful discussions and the anonymous referees for their suggestions which helped improve this paper. This work was partially supported by the Labex CEMPI (ANR-11-LABX-0007-01).

References

[1] A. J. Baddeley and M. N. M. V. Lieshout. Area-interaction point processes. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 47(4):601–619, 1995.

[2] S. N. Chiu, D. Stoyan, W. S. Kendall, and J. Mecke. *Stochastic geometry and its applications.* John Wiley & Sons, 3 edition, 2013.

[3] D. Dereudre. The existence of quermass-interaction processes for nonlocally stable interaction and nonbounded convex grains. *Adv. Appli. Prob.*, 41(3):664–681, 2009.

[4] D. Dereudre. Variational principle for gibbs point process with finite range and stable interaction. *to appear in Electronic Communications in Probability (available on arxiv:1506.05000)*, 2016.

[5] P. J. Diggle, T. Fiksel, P. Grabarnik, Y. Ogata, D. Stoyan, and M. Tanemura. On parameter estimation for pairwise interaction point processes. *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique*, pages 99–117, 1994.

[6] P. J. Diggle and R. J. Gratton. Monte carlo methods of inference for implicit statistical models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 193–227, 1984.

[7] H. Georgii. Canonical and grand canonical Gibbs states for continuum systems. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 48(1):31–51, 1976.

[8] H. Georgii. The equivalence of ensembles for classical systems of particles. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 80, Nos 5/6:1341–1377, 1994.

[9] H. Georgii. Large deviations and the equivalence of ensembles for gibbsian particle systems with superstable interaction. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 99:171–195, 1994.

[10] H. O. Georgii. *Gibbs measure and phase transitions.* De Gruyter, 1988.

[11] C. J. Geyer and J. Møller. Simulation procedures and likelihood inference for spatial point processes. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, pages 359–373, 1994.

[12] X. Guyon. *Random Fields on a Network*. Springer-Verlag, 1995.

[13] J. Illian, A. Penttinen, and D. Stoyan. *Statistical analysis and modelling of spatial point patterns.* Wiley-Interscience, 2008.

[14] J. L. Jensen. Asymptotic normality of estimates in spatial point processes. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, pages 97–109, 1993.

[15] W. S. Kendall, M. N. M. V. Lieshout, and A. J. Baddeley. Quermass-interaction processes conditions for stability. *Adv. Appli. Prob.*, 31:315–342, 1999.

[16] H. Künsch. Thermodynamics and statistical analysis of Gaussian random fields. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 58(3):407–421, 1981.

[17] S. Mase. Uniform LAN condition of planar Gibbsian point processes and optimality of maximum likelihood estimators of soft-core potential functions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 92(1):51–67, 1992.

[18] S. Mase. Asymptotic properties of MLE's of Gibbs models on $\mathbb{R}^d$. *Unpublished manuscript*, 2002.

[19] J. Mateu and F. Montes. Likelihood inference for gibbs processes in the analysis of spatial point patterns. *International statistical review*, 69(1):81–104, 2001.

[20] J. Møller and R. Waagepetersen. *Statistical Inference and Simulation for Spatial Point Processes.* Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2003.

[21] X. Nguyen and H. Zessin. Integral and differential characterizations Gibbs processes. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 88(1):105–115, 1979.

[22] Y. Ogata and M. Tanemura. Likelihood analysis of spatial point patterns. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, pages 496–518, 1984.

[23] D. K. Pickard. Inference for discrete markov fields : the simplest nontrivial case. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 82(397):90–96, 1987.

[24] C. Preston. *Random fields.* Springer Verlag, 1976.

[25] D. Ruelle. *Statistical Mechanics. Rigorous Results.* (Benjamin, New-York), 1969.

[26] D. Ruelle. Superstable interactions in classical statistical mechanics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 18:127–159, 1970.

[27] M. Van Lieshout. *Markov point processes and their applications.* World Scientific, 2000.

[28] S. Varadhan. Large deviations and applications. In *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XV–XVII, 1985–87*, pages 1–49. Springer, 1988.

[29] B. Widom and J. Rowlinson. New model for the study of liquid-vapor phase transitions. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 52:1670–1684, 1970.